The Nation

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 14, 1919 No. 2815

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 925

EDITORIALS:

An Exhausted Virtue 929
Literature as Propaganda 930
The Negro at Bay 931
Reason in Revolution 932

AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL UNREST By Basil Manly 933

THE GREAT WINNIPEG STRIKE. By J. A. Stevenson 935

PROTECTING SOUTHERN WOMANHOOD. By Herbert J. Seligmann .. 938

THE CARVING OF RUSSIA. By Lincoln Colcord 940

BISMARCK. By Carl Becker 942

A DREAM OF ENGLAND. By Charles Wharton Stork 945

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 945

CORRESPONDENCE 946

LITERATURE:

Seven Artisans and a Genius 948
The Case of Alcohol 949
A Magnificent Gamble 950
Dark Blue and Rose 951

BOOKS IN BRIEF 952

BOOKS OF THE WEEK 953

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 955

THE peace treaty is now out. The unblushing Senate has dragged it into the light, and there is no trouble now about seeing why it was suppressed. The Saar Valley provisions assure absolute French domination and, apparently, ultimate annexation. The German concessions in Shantung, granted to Japan, carry not only territorial rights, but all the German investments in all forms of movable and immovable property; Japan gets them all free of charge. The Reparations Commission will exercise practically absolute political control of German internal affairs for thirty years, at least; and the Germans must pay the salaries and expenses of these satraps and their staffs. Germany must make over any collateral held by her for payment of Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish war loans, and the collateral behind her guarantee of three issues of Turkish currency and a Turkish domestic loan; and she must also make over any claim that she or her nationals may have against these nations, arising out of these loans. When a sense of the moral quality of these measures works down into our people, we think they will be heard from. We repeat, it is no wonder that the Peace Conference did not want its work to be known.

THE issue in Paris over the modification of the peace terms to Germany reveals in an especially clear light the difference between the mind of Wilson and the mind of Lloyd George. Mr. Lloyd George, who manages, in spite of opportunism and insincerity, to remain fairly human and to keep his feet partially on the ground, has discovered the real trend of events both at home and abroad, and is beginning to trim his sails to a new breeze. He recognizes the power of the gathering labor protest against the cruelty and immorality of the treaty, and is doing his best to mitigate its imperialism. President Wilson, on the other hand, dwelling constantly in his academic solitude, never aware of the reality of social manifestations, and now sinking into a relapse of soured idealism, insists that the treaty is all that it should be, and that it must therefore be driven down the throat of Germany as it stands. It is plain to be seen that Lloyd George is choosing his take-off for a running jump back into the radical camp; while Wilson, the whilom leader of world radicalism, a post which he never honestly deserved or filled, is now, with equal inconsistency and unworthiness, content to sojourn awhile in the camp of the imperialists. The Wilson psychology is the phenomenon of the era. But Lloyd George is simpler and more understandable.

SO the Austrians, too, have the bad taste to declare that the nobly just peace treaty is certain to destroy their infant republic. This, coming after Dr. Renner's proper admission of Austrian guilt and his addressing the Conference in French, as a sign of subserviency, is highly disappointing. Not that it will avail the Austrians to recall to Mr. Wilson his sacred pledge to the American and Austrian peoples (December 4, 1917) "that we do not wish in any way to impair or rearrange the Austro-Hungarian Empire." Other times, other morals, other promises, other principles —for Woodrow Wilson. The difficulty for what is left of the Austrian wreck is the supreme contempt the world has had for that decadent monarchy upon which rests the chief guilt of starting the war, and for a Government which, long before the end, desired peace yet knew not how to accomplish it. But what is not being realized is that the old conditions are dead, that the old guilty crowd is no more, and that Austria, even if it should now be ignored, is so wrecked as to be beyond the possibility of again being a disturbing factor in European or Balkan politics. This being the case, these questions arise: Is the proposed treaty one of revenge? Will it help to build up a strong, liberal state in mid-Europe? Does it make for lasting peace and content? Will it at once create a spirit of revenge against Hungary and Czecho-Slovakia? Does it give any hope of ending the famine and destitution in Austria? Will it make for communism? These questions demand an answer; yet it is not clear from the treaty itself whether the Big Three have considered them in the slightest degree. Time will speedily demand and receive the replies, League of Nations or no League.

ALL honor to little Norway and littler Switzerland, to Denmark and Sweden! Beset by troubles of their own, dependent in large measure upon the Allies for their food supplies, these four brave little neutrals refuse any longer to bow the knee to *force majeure*. Asked by the victors in the war to join the Allies in reëstablishing the blockade against Germany, and on a tighter basis than before, should the Germans refuse to sign the treaty, these countries have come back with so indignant a "No" as to stir the pulses and make one's heart beat with higher hopes than for a long while. The sanctimonious Allies and the utterly disappointing President of the United States may deliberately plan to starve millions of women and children to achieve their aims; Switzerland and Denmark and Sweden and Norway will have no part in this crime, come what may. And yet there are those who see nothing ahead but black despair.

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here is as fine a bit of moral courage as the whole war has brought out. But nothing could demonstrate more clearly than this attempted snapping of the whip over the neutrals how utterly the Big Four are now out of touch with the moral sentiment of the world. With English and French labor protesting and about to join hands, with many groups in England, according to a New York *Sun* despatch, opposed to the treaty, they deliberately propose to deprive a starving people of much food if their treaty is so monstrously unjust that the starving people will not sign it. We do not believe that the moral sentiment of America or England will endure any such procedure; but we are profoundly grateful to the "Little Four" for refusing to yield to the policy of dishonor which was to be forced upon them. The moral quality of their act is in no degree impaired because their course corresponds with their business interests.

MRS. FLORENCE KELLEY, who recently returned from Switzerland, in an address at the National Conference of Social Work last week, accused the United States Government of being a party to the starvation of the children of mid-European countries by agreeing to an embargo which prevented even those stores of food accumulated in neutral countries for purposes of relief from reaching the countries blighted by famine. The "vast experiment in human vivisection" being carried on in Germany with such eminent success by the Allied blockade, is apparently to be extended to Hungary. The purpose appears to be different, but the method is identical. Germany is to be starved into signing away its life and its hope of the future. Hungary, which has from the start exhibited an embarrassing readiness to compromise and yield to the territorial and other demands of the Allies, is to be starved into a "democratic" form of government. Although the present Soviet Government was set up bloodlessly and represents many of the elements formerly arrayed against it, the Allies are reported to have ruled that the embargo on goods for Hungary will be continued until "democratic" forms of government are established in that hapless land. A news dispatch from Paris to the *New York Times* asserts that "things in Hungary are going from bad to worse. No Government appears to exist capable of sending delegates to the Peace Conference." Just why a Soviet Government is not capable of choosing delegates is not explained. The dispatch continues: "The efforts of the Allies to send food supplies through Hungary are hampered." It is reasonable to suppose that efforts to send food *through* a starving country might be hampered, but the "American representatives on the Economic Council . . . intend to propose that Hungarian conditions be remedied through military force in the hope of establishing order and insuring a Government capable of arranging peace terms." After a year of the application of the same remedy to Russia no such Government has yet emerged. Is the same horrid farce to be played in Hungary? Starvation and invasion—these, in the new language recently developed at Paris, are the translations for that obsolete phrase, "the self-determination of peoples."

IT is with profound regret that we announce at one and the same time the birth and the death of the Rhenish Republic. This hopeful child, fathered by fear, mothered by cupidity, and ushered into life by French midwives, promptly found French military foster parents to watch over it and fairly to blow the breath of life into its tiny lungs. But even forced respiration availed not, and the promising infant survived less than a week. We regret to add that prudish American and British military neighbors not only refused to aid in forcing artificial respiration but deliberately did their best to shorten the child's life by saying that it was not the Anglo-Saxon way to countenance illegitimate children of this character. Naturally the French, and notably Marshal Foch, are distinctly disappointed. Being denied at the Peace Conference the right to procreate a new member of the family of nations to be a perpetual barrier on the Rhine between Germany and France, they thought they would go ahead none the less, but the American and British generalissimos declined to take part in the conspiracy. Hardly had the infant been born when the French military authorities posted proclamations informing all the Germans in their territory that they must obey the commands and laws of the new republic or go to jail. It will be interesting to see how soon the notices are revoked. But their revocation will not return to the French the large sums of money with which they staked Dr. Dorten, the head of this fly-by-night republic.

THE strike situation in France is rapidly coming to a head. This movement, springing out of an inordinate rise in the cost of living, seems to be gathering to itself all of the revolutionary potentialities that have smouldered in France for the past two years. As in England, Germany, and, indeed, in every place where economic pressure is inducing strikes, and where the strikes, in conformity with a new principle, gradually assume a political nature, the outstanding feature of the French situation is the insubordination of the rank and file of labor and the inability of conservative labor leadership to stem the radical tide. It is now authentically reported that over 500,000 men are out on strike in the department of the Seine. In the north of France the miners' strike continues, the men having declined to accept the agreement fathered by the Labor Ministry. The conference between the workmen and employers in the Paris metal strike has also been broken off. The labor leaders would prefer to wait until they could launch a general strike in conjunction with British and Italian labor; but the rank and file are forcing the leaders' hand. The reason for this pressure is not far to seek. New prices of refrigerated meats which went into effect in France on June 9 show an increase of from fifteen to twenty per cent. over those of last month, and the price of fresh meat has actually advanced on an average of twelve and a half per cent. in the last ten days. Reports from France indicate that public opinion recognizes the gravity of the crisis. Professional and student organizations are being formed to take over the running of public utilities. "These and similar movements," says Walter Duranty in the *New York Times*, "may form the nucleus of a big bourgeois organization, anti-labor and especially anti-communist and anti-revolutionary—for it is already evident that the logical conclusion of the labor agitation will be revolution and communism." The railway men were within an ace of stampeding their leaders into a strike last Friday; as we write, it seems possible that this result may be accomplished at the general meeting on June 10. "If such be the case," continues Mr. Duranty, "a great battle between authority and labor will be on before the end of the week."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE news of the week from Russia is little short of amazing. In a brief but pregnant dispatch to the *New York Globe* and the *Chicago Daily News*, Isaac Don Levine, one of the most capable and impartial journalists now in Russia, confirmed the report previously received from Bolshevist sources that Admiral Kolchak had been badly defeated and thrown back seventy-five miles, with the loss of 50,000 prisoners. The Admiral was close to the Volga with his armies early in the spring, but at no time did he capture Samara, Saratov, or other large central Russian cities. A week ago the Red Army was approaching Ufa, Kolchak's base. "The Russian masses regard Admiral Kolchak as definitely Czarist," writes Mr. Levine. "The tremendous effort of Soviet Russia and the enthusiasm for general mobilization impress one deeply. Allied recognition . . . would completely confirm in the eyes of the Russian people the Soviet argument that the Allies seek the restoration of Czarism." For many weeks we have been told by the newspapers, and especially through the Associated Press dispatches from Kolchak's headquarters, that his armies were winning victory after victory, extending the sway of the so-called Omsk Government throughout Central Russia, and demolishing Bolshevism wherever they went. The exact contrary seems to have been the case. In spite of this news, an intensified campaign of propaganda for the recognition of the Kolchak régime is now being waged in the American press; full-page advertisements costing many thousands of dollars have appeared in every important newspaper, and the public is being given to suppose that Kolchak is the great liberal saviour of all Russia. In the meanwhile, Kolchak himself has refused to accede without qualification to the demand of the Allies that he recognize the independence of Finland and the autonomy of the "new states formed on the borders of Old Russia" as a condition of his own recognition, and has also declined to reconvene the old Constituent Assembly, on the ground that it was elected before the iniquity of the Bolsheviki was fully apparent, and that it would therefore be unduly favorable to them. Instead, he proposes to summon a new constituent assembly, which will doubtless be satisfactorily "democratic."

SPEAKER GILLETT, addressing the opening session of the Pan-American Commercial Conference last week, saw fit to attack the Carranza Government in Mexico for its failure to protect the rights of foreign investors. The speech, in exceedingly bad taste under such auspices, immediately drew from Señor Rojo, the Mexican representative at the Conference, an indignant protest; and the incident is calculated to contribute not a little to the friction that exists between Mexico and the United States. In a subsequent statement, Speaker Gillett frankly admitted that it was his intention to offend the Mexican representatives. In other words, he was speaking for American intervention in Mexico; no other interpretation can be placed upon his words. He is not acting alone. In the past two weeks the American press has accorded an amount of space to Mexico entirely incommensurate with the importance of events in that much-misrepresented land. The casual newspaper reader would be hard put to it not to believe that Mexico had passed into a state of lawlessness and violence, and that the Carranza Government had practically thrown up the sponge. We seriously doubt, however, that anything in particular has happened. From trustworthy reports we hear that the country is in a fairly peaceable condition.

THE cordial reception given the Filipino Independence Mission on its recent tour of the United States afforded welcome indication of a strong public sentiment favoring the prompt redemption of the numerous official pledges that have been made to our Asiatic subjects. It should not be forgotten that the actual grant of independence to the Filipinos must be made by Congress, and the American press and public ought to maintain a steady pressure on that body until the work is accomplished; for we may be sure that subtle influences will be at work opposing freedom. There is no doubt as to the wishes of the Filipinos. A Manila dispatch under date of June 5 reads as follows: "Returns from the election just held here indicate a sweeping victory for the Nationalist party, which supported the sending of the recent 'independence mission' to America. The Nationalist vote was especially heavy in Manila." That good government is no substitute for self-government has been demonstrated over and over again. The Filipinos are clearly of that opinion, and we trust that our Government will prove its good faith by the prompt passage of the legislation necessary to give them control of their own affairs.

THE new Attorney General, Mr. Palmer, has taken the most praiseworthy attitude towards the bomb-throwers by whom he was singled out as one of the victims. While the New York dailies have raged against all liberals and radicals and particularly against certain unnamed but despicable liberal weeklies—can they mean the *Review*?—Mr. Palmer comes right out to say that he is neither cowed nor stampeded, and that he does not see the need for any more repressive legislation whatsoever. He declares, moreover, that if we should now go in for violent repression, in the manner, we presume, of Bismarck against the Socialists in the early eighties and of the Czar against the Nihilists, the Government would play directly into the hands of the "Reds." He, too, has noticed apparently that all the bombs were so placed as to frighten rather than to kill, and suspects, therefore, that it may be the exact purpose of the anarchists to bring about the violent reactionary measures for which the *New York Times* and its contemporaries cry out. Mr. David Lawrence telegraphs, moreover, that the Government sees that the question is bound up also with the release of the political offenders of the type of Eugene V. Debs. "Many persons of prominence," he says, "who are not at all identified with the 'Red' movement but who want to see it nipped in the bud, have been urging President Wilson, for instance, to pardon these offenders. The subject has been taken up by letter and cable with the President in Paris." There is no doubt whatever that these two matters are directly related and that they need the most careful consideration. The bomb-throwers must not be allowed to think that they have terrorized the Government into releasing political offenders. Yet on the other hand the fact that many persons like Rose Pastor Stokes, Kate Richards O'Hare, and Congressman Berger, are in prison or under sentence is causing widespread discontent. It is a great pity that Mr. Wilson is not on the spot to act.

THOSE who come to town on suburban trains, and who listen to the labor views of the typical American business man as he reads his morning newspaper and condoles with his companion over the world's unrest, will recognize the fidelity to form of the labor opinions which our press gives us on its financial and business pages. The *Evening*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Post, for instance, in its financial edition of last Saturday, carried a special column dispatch from Boston on the subject, "What Labor Wants." "Recent Bolshevistic demonstrations in the name of labor," says this dispatch with due confidence and solemnity, "are regarded with no great concern. They show how easy-going we Americans are; we are fully conscious of our ability to put a stop to them when they become too great a nuisance." A little later the journalist, who reveals himself throughout as a profound student of our economic situation, indulges in this comment: "A Boston business man, head of a large industry, was asked this week what was the matter with labor. His answer was, 'Overfed.' This was not a dictum of mere class selfishness, but an assertion of a truly considerate person who had given a good deal of conscientious thought to the problem." Those who pin their hopes for America in a great industrial conference between workers and employers should take note of the above-outlined state of mind, which, we fear, lies not far short of the Ultima Thule in economic philosophy which the rank and file of our employers so far have reached. There would seem to be still some distance for them to go.

WHETHER it was the presence of the British labor leaders, Miss Bondfield, Miss MacArthur, and Mrs. Barton, or whether the Women's Trade Union League has caught the temper of radical labor in every country, it would be hard to say, but the national convention of the League held last week at Philadelphia exhibited a lively concern with international matters unusual in American labor gatherings of any sort. In addition to the familiar recommendations regarding the organization and protection of women in industry, the convention adopted, almost unanimously, a resolution demanding "the recognition of the Russian Soviet Government by the Peace Conference at Paris and by the Government of the United States." It demanded, in the name of the Constitution, the withdrawal of American troops from Russia, the lifting of the blockade, and the immediate dispatch of food relief through the American Red Cross. These resolutions, together with certain firm demands for freedom and equality at home and the political as well as the economic organization of workers, indicate a measure of intelligent solidarity and an ability to look ahead which the American Federation of Labor, meeting this week at Atlantic City, can hardly be expected to emulate.

THE *lusus naturae* remains the fascination and the despair of biological science. In the realm of morals, too, it remains a mystery why the righteous man may so often save neither son nor daughter by his righteousness, but himself alone. Why, for example, should Marcus Aurelius, most admirable of men, the very flower of pagan culture, have had for a son the infamous Commodus? We have had a painful reminder of this intrinsic uncertainty in nature's processes, by reading a recent item from Seattle. While the alert and energetic mayor of that city, Ole Hanson, has been starring around the East, impressing vast audiences with a superheated sense of that devotion to Americanism which might be inferred of one bearing his fine old Anglo-Saxon name, his local understudy, Acting-Mayor W. D. Lane, has walked in the counsel of the ungodly, and stood in the way of the sinners, and sat in the seat of the scornful. The dispatch is brief and pregnant. Hulet M. Wells and Sam Sadler were scheduled to depart from Seattle on June 4, bound for the Federal penitentiary to serve a two-year sentence for sedition. On the night of the 3d, three hundred men and women prominent in labor circles gave them a banquet. Among those present was Mr. Lane. Thus sadly are the public morals dislocated when their natural guardians are absent on missionary duty. President Wilson goes to Paris, Mayor Hanson tours the East—and see what happens!

WOMAN suffrage through Congress at last? One must rub one's eyes not to believe oneself dreaming. To the shades of Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Lucy Stone, how incredible it must seem! When the amendment which bears Miss Anthony's name—whether justly or otherwise—was first proposed, it seemed about as practical as baying the moon. It took a very brave legislator then to admit that he favored suffrage at all; but to find any one who would commit himself to such a delusion as the plan for Congressional action—that was hardly possible. But the impossible is here, and loud and long should be the rejoicing. There was most encouraging rivalry to see which State Legislature should be the first to ratify the national action, Illinois carrying off the honor by all but unanimous vote. Who can be without cheer when amid all the existing bitterness and hatreds, the class rivalries, and all the evidences of widespread reaction, this great reform becomes an inevitability? Only those who expect too much reorganization too quickly, or who are wedded to the wrong methods of procuring it, such as physical force, have reason for downheartedness—nobody else. All honor to all the women who won the fight, in whatever camp, of whatever faith, for they have bravely carried forward the torch of liberty.

SIR HARRY JOHNSTON seems in a fair way to bid for the lapsed title of Peter Abelard, as "the one man unto whom it was granted to know everything." Beginning life as a student of the Royal Academy of Arts, he became a painter of quality; then a traveller and explorer, and a member of the consular service, picking up enough zoology and philology to write treatises on the British mammals and the Bantu and semi-Bantu languages. Then he was attracted to historical studies, and did six good volumes on colonial pioneers, as well as a history of the colonization of Africa by alien races. He commanded a scientific expedition of the Royal Society in 1884 and made some biological studies. His contributions to the study of the Negro problem are of lasting value. Meanwhile he appears to have done something significant with music in an amateur way. Now he has written a novel, and the critics say it is an excellent one. We are fortunate to have such men to illuminate and inform a world that seems wholly given over to specialization. It is good to remember William de Morgan and Professor Ebers. Perhaps Ebers's novels were not truly great—we do not undertake to say—but it was a great thing that an Egyptologist wrote them. We think, in our perversity, that the quality of our science, our literature, our art, and our music would be better, and the general quality of life much humanized and refined by the activities of a few more such men—and that, after all, is what everybody wants. A humane life—that is the great thing, and these men reflect and promote it while the specialists do not. If we were bound to a choice, we would not surrender Max Müller's frail little volume called "Deutsche Liebe" for the whole imposing row of his "Sacred Books of the East."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Exhausted Virtue

PUBLIC patience with the Peace Conference is no longer patience, but a weak and degenerate pusillanimity. We hope that the Congress will at once cut the foundation out from under the whole intolerable situation by passing a resolution declaring summarily that the state of war is at an end, demanding the immediate withdrawal and demobilization of all our expeditionary forces, renouncing responsibility for further police duty in Europe, and authorizing the resumption of free commerce. It is perfectly competent for the Congress to do this. Unless by some unauthorized and improper secret arrangement, of which the Congress may take no cognizance, the United States is independent of the Allied Powers, and has corresponding liberty of action. Our official designation as a "co-belligerent" and an "associated Government" has been carefully preserved, and its implications should now be turned to account. We entered the war as an independent Power for the attainment of certain specific ends. We have Mr. Wilson's word for it—and, what is far more valuable, we have a general popular conviction—that these ends have now been attained. As far as the United States is concerned, everyone knows that the war is at an end and German militarism triumphantly overthrown. Now, therefore, is the time for an official declaration by the Congress, not only for our own moral advantage, but for that of the whole world. If the representatives of this people should thus energetically serve notice of determination to resume an abdicated control and direction of the nation's own business, it would be the most wholesome and powerful stimulant to democratic order, the world over, that could be imagined. There would be a different and far more salutary spirit informing the doings at Versailles after Mr. Wilson had come home in obedience to such an intimation from the Congress. The plain people of Europe—small wonder!—are dissatisfied with the quality of the proposed peace, and apparently well aware that any further prescriptions compounded out of the same quack pharmacopœia will be quite as far from what they need and demand. They are now beginning to express their resentment by such irregular modes as they conceive to be available. How much better, then, how clearing and steadying, if they could have from this country an example of effective expression through the authorized and regular agency set up for such purposes!

The day of makeshift, compromise, and unclear thinking is past. We all see now the inevitable outcome of attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable and to accommodate orders of action between which no accommodation is possible. It was well enough six months ago that the United States should take part in the Peace Conference instead of simply declaring its share in the war at an end and resuming its independent way. Mr. Wilson had been especially active in devising and publishing a whole series of high international ideals. This had its effect upon the popular conscience and will. The country was full of the naïve expectation that this was a war to end war, and that it was so intended by its fautors. This, we can now see, was a fantastic expectation, since war cannot possibly be ended by war, and those who promote war do not do so with any such purpose in view. But our people did not know that, and were easily persuaded otherwise; their best instincts were enlisted. They freely consented, therefore, to the breach of continuity in our foreign policy, in the hope of seeing somewhat at least of the sort of peace that Mr. Wilson and his colleagues had held out to them in prospect.

This hope it was which had already made them endure with incredible patience the most shameful indignities from Mr. Wilson that could be imposed upon any people calling itself free. They endured the abrogation of the constitutional rights they possessed, the eclipse of the Congress, the resolution of their governmental system into an autocracy as sinister and as absolute as any that the Middle Ages ever saw; all for the hope of the Larger Good. This hope reconciled them even to the unrepresentative personnel of the American Commission. But so far from the realization of their hope, they have seen democracy despised and rejected; and the practical outcome of the conference, as Mr. Ramsay Macdonald excellently says, is four gentlemen sitting in Paris, treating Europe as a grocer treats a hogshead of sugar. They have seen an inconceivably impudent recrudescence and brazen stiffening of financial imperialism; the League of Nations covenant a letter-of-marque for unlimited economic exploitation; while the watered-down paraphrase of the peace treaty, which is all that has been officially vouchsafed us, is a deed of chattel slavery for the whole German people for at least thirty years to come. Well, it was a good, a useful lesson. Like most lessons, it might have been learned some easier way; but no matter, it is learned. Now let the Congress decide that our period of tutelage—and theirs—is over, and take the simple step necessary to end it; and let us go on by the light of the expensive wisdom we have gained.

But what would become of Europe? Mr. Taft and the League advocates go up and down the earth promulgating the argument of dreadful consequences, drawing depressing pictures of the desolation that would ensue if the United States drew out of compliance with the will of the Allies. We cannot see it in quite that way. Mr. Taft assumes that the interest of the peoples of Europe is identical with that of the system of financial imperialism represented at Versailles. But that is precisely what it is not; it is squarely opposed to it. We think that this system would suffer greatly if the United States withdrew its supporting hand; but that the *peoples* would suffer much, that they would suffer an iota of what they are suffering now, we greatly doubt. If only they were let alone, we think they would prove quite able to look after themselves. Our withdrawal, with the consequent lightening of pressure upon them from their own exploiters, would, in fact, be a measure of relief amounting almost to emancipation.

But however this may be, the duty that we seem to see resting on the Congress is one imposed by simple honesty and self-respect. Being in the interest of so many people, it is presumably not good politics; at least, not in the tradition of good politics. But traditional politics are now so broken down and discredited that—who knows?—the Congress may be master-politicians enough to discern what is quite obvious to nearly everybody else, that at this juncture a public act of downright, direct, disinterested honesty would turn out to be the most popular thing possible, and therefore the keenest politics of all. Popular instinct now, we believe, is wholly on the side of Richard Cobden's masterly saying, that international peace and good will depend on as little intercourse as possible betwixt *Governments* (the italics are Cobden's own) and as much as possible betwixt *peoples*. The people are tired of the sterile intercourse betwixt Governments at Versailles. A congressional resolution passed at

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

noon today, and ships starting out in free commerce at noon tomorrow, would do more for the peace of the world than twenty centuries of clandestine conniving by the agents of financial imperialism.

Literature as Propaganda

IN an interview some time ago, Madame Yvette Guilbert spoke of herself as *La Propagande*, and of her art as a work of interpretation, not only of French idealism to Americans, but of love, faith, hope, and repentance to all mankind. No one who witnessed her moving impersonations will dispute the title or deny her mission. In one of her astonishing recitals given in New York in the early days of the war, she introduced her reading of a fifteenth-century poem called *La Paix* with the pathetic cry, "Ah, you English people, give us peace!" Well, peace of a sort has come, and it has come partly through the agency of "English people"; but there remains a work to do hardly less urgent. No one can fail to be struck with dismay by the sudden chill that has come over the relations of America and France, or by the curiously distorted notion of the French people that our men are bringing home. It reminds us how uncertain are all *rapprochements* between nations of different races and traditions, how easily exhausted our stores of sympathy, how shallow our comprehensions. This is due, of course, like most of the misunderstandings and prejudices of life, to a lack of imagination, which is, in turn, due to insufficient knowledge. No Anglo-Saxon comes into contact with a Latin people without finding much to puzzle and even to repel him. They understand us better than we understand them, because they have a finer social sense and a wider social experience than we, as well as more imagination. Nevertheless, we are certain to get on each other's nerves, and the only way to avoid the danger of serious misunderstanding is to strike below the surface to the strata of character that we all have in common. We are prone to assume that trade relations are the natural agency of mutual understanding between peoples, but it is doubtful whether they really accomplish much. It might have been anticipated that suffering and sacrifice in a common cause would throw down racial barriers if anything would, but this is evidently not certain. The truth is that neither trade nor war will do the business, for the one does not touch the true springs of character, and the other is, fortunately, not lasting. For the process of acquiring a mutual understanding that is based on something more than expediency is slow and gradual, because it goes to the roots of national and racial life.

A knowledge of these is to be obtained only from a nation's literature. Nowhere else do the true motives that actuate national conduct appear, the genuine traits that, beneath all disguises of custom, really constitute the national soul. The materialist does not believe this, because he underestimates all forces that cannot be reduced to statistics. But let us ask ourselves whether the industrial and commercial triumphs of Americans are really the full measure of their spiritual capacity. The names of our captains of industry and bankers and inventors represent our most conspicuous achievement in the eyes of Europe, but are we content to be judged by them alone? Do we not insist, when we are charged with unqualified materialism, that no one can understand the American character who does not know Lowell and Emerson and Whitman and Lincoln? If we assume therefore that arrogance and self-seeking are the dominant notes in Italian psychology, it is either because we forget Dante and Leopardi and Carducci, or because we do not know them. But these men are the true representatives of the Italian mind. The Gentiles rage, and the people devise vain things, but underneath the turbulence and the vanity abide the heroic endurance, the lofty vision of the Latin soul. Frenchmen are wanting in magnanimity to a fallen enemy, if you will; they lack a certain sense of world-issues; but they are the countrymen of Pascal and Fénelon, of St. Louis and the Maid. Can anyone who is familiar with the French literature of the past ten years, the work of the young poets and novelists and critics who have fallen on the field of honor, fail to perceive that the chivalry of France, her capacity for devotion to ideal ends, is unquenched and unquenchable? Russia is declared by many to be a welter of misdirected idealisms, or unblushing demagogisms, as you like. It is at best a land of very far-off promise, at worst a portent and a menace; but it is the land of Turgenev and Tolstoy and Dostoevsky and Breshkovskaya. It is therefore a land with a soul, benighted and oppressed by evil dreams, that goes "sounding on, a dim and perilous way." And Germany, too, when all is said, is the land that brought forth Heine and Goethe. The madness that has overwhelmed her goes deep, but it is inconceivable that the soul of the German people, as it is recorded in her literature, should be beyond the healing touch of time.

Three years ago, Granville Barker remarked in the New York *Evening Post* that the wounds of the war must be healed by "the men of imagination" and "through the imaginations of the people"—healed, that is to say, by friend and enemy meeting one another on the only ground that is common to them all, the ground of their humanity. We do not say the ground of art, for that might be misunderstood. The world is incorrigible in its conviction that art is a luxury, and that, in times like these, it must give way to the stern necessities of the hour. We will say, therefore, that what the nations need is to discover what they have in common, and that is the "admiration, hope, and love" by which they really live. But this is literature in its essence, the flowering of the spirit of man. It becomes, then, the duty and high privilege of everyone who is prepared to do so to act as an interpreter of at least one alien literature to his own people, or of his own literature to an alien folk. Teachers, translators, critics, actors—all are called to be propagandists to the most desirable of ends, the spiritual reconciliation of the world. It is particularly important for Americans to acknowledge this obligation, for our intellectual isolation, like our political isolation, has been extreme. It would be absurd to fancy that any two European races are as little prepared to understand each other as we are to understand any one of them. Matthew Arnold remarked long ago that a cultivated Englishman felt far more at home intellectually with Frenchmen, Germans, and Italians than with Americans, and though we may resent the fact, it is not difficult to explain. Our most pressing educational need, perhaps, is to discover that a really comprehensive knowledge of a foreign language and literature is a mere decency. To be able to lay one's mind beside the mind of an alien contemporary, to find beneath the differences that divide us the common ground upon which we stand—this is the task of the "men of imagination." This is to be, in something more than the social sense, a citizen of the world. This is the task we should strive to perform.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Negro at Bay

TO print such an article as Mr. Herbert J. Seligmann's, which appears elsewhere in this issue, is not an easy task for any editor, but we should be lacking in public duty if we failed to inform our readers of the gravity of the race situation existing in the South, largely as a result of the war. A year ago it looked as if, owing to the economic disarrangements of the conflict, the Negroes would profit much by it. The lack of labor resulted in an unequalled use in the North of colored workmen and a corresponding improvement in the social and economic status of those in the South. The extraordinary exodus from below Mason and Dixon's line worried Southern employers, and endangered the South's prosperity and progress. It naturally resulted in increasing largely the wages paid to skilled and unskilled labor, and in distinct and promising efforts in various cities to ameliorate the conditions of life of which the Negroes complained, with a view to keeping them in the South. But with the return of the colored soldiers from France and the ending of the war boom, the hopeful note has faded out of the news from the South, and it has taken on a sinister aspect. It is the testimony of Southern newspapers like the Memphis *Commercial-Appeal* that the friction between the races has become little less than gravely alarming.

Everywhere there is evidence of friction and discontent. There has been a widespread epidemic of lynching, as Mr. Seligmann testifies. More than that, the Ku Klux have begun to ride again. On a single morning recently they burned in Putnam County, Georgia, five Negro churches, two schools, and a lodge hall. They have appeared in public in other places. These are but a few manifestations of the spirit of bitterness and resentment which, among the colored people, is a direct outgrowth of the war. The white people say that it is due to the Negro soldiers' being treated as equals by French men and women. The Negroes are incensed because, almost everywhere in the South, the black soldiers have returned unnoticed, while the streets have been beflagged and whole cities turned upside down to greet their white brothers-in-arms. False stories of the lack of prowess of some of the Ninety-second (colored) Division have evoked bitterness. Negroes were drafted into the war and were called upon to be heroes to fight for democracy. They were confident that after democracy was rendered safe abroad they would receive some few crumbs of democracy at home—that at least they would be allowed to vote for Governors and President, to have some representation as well as taxation. They return to find their hopes dashed again. They receive no thanks, even for the memorable services of the black pioneer regiments, which admittedly rendered notable aid in winning the war by doing a large share of the laboring, stevedore, and construction work without which Pershing's army could not have done what it did. They return to find—the Ku Klux riding again.

What is their spirit? A bitter one. Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois in a most dangerous and mistaken article in the *Crisis* declares that they come back *fighting* for their rights and that they will continue to battle for them. He and others exult that there are now 100,000 black Americans trained to arms. The new Ku Klux, they say, will not find the Negroes cowed as were the freedmen of 1865-70; they will find men ready to die for their liberties and to protect their families. This is the counsel of madness. It leads nowhere but to bloodshed without result. It threatens to make a shambles of the South. It is creating the most ominous situation since the carpet-bagger days—and every one of the lynchings reported from the South but adds fuel to the flames. The voices of the moderates on both sides are no longer heeded; the roar of the mob rises higher and higher.

What to do? Shall the press remain silent? Shall we gloss over the lynchings, and pretend, in happy-go-lucky American way, that all's well in the South? Shall we merely dwell upon the fact that at bottom it is all an economic problem? That it is far from being one-sided? That the South is deeply exasperated by the inefficiency of Negro labor, more than ever noticeable just now because of the war developments? For our part, though we recognize that fundamentally it is an economic problem, though we recognize how difficult is the lot of the whites, how plain it is that the right is not all on one side, it seems to us the duty of patriotism to put the fact on record that the South lives over a volcano; that the proper solution of the problem calls for all the statesmanship of the country. Is it not perfectly plain that if these colored citizens of ours are to be Ku Kluxed, if all their political rights are always to be withheld from them, if their economic status is unrelieved, if the country's deliberate neglect of their education is to continue—in short, if their bitter unhappiness is still to be allowed to grow, they may, especially because of the emotionalism of their natures, become the easiest victims of those who would reform America by force? Extremists, anarchists, preachers of sabotage and violence of every type will find many recruits if the Negroes' just grievances are not immediately put in process of removal. Against any possibility of this, there ought to be immediate action—not later, when the mischief is on.

The intensification of this gravest of social problems is one of the terrible legacies of the war which are so rapidly filling up the debit side of the ledger in which the good and evil results of the conflict are being totalled. Fortunately, it is easy to lay out a constructive programme for solving the problem, as the *Nation* has so often done during these last fifty years, a programme which commends itself warmly to the most enlightened members of both races—to white men like those composing the University Race Commission no less than to Negroes. Such a programme includes a cessation of that economic exploitation of the Negro which makes him in many sections of the South little more than a chattel of the large plantation owners, the ending of lynching and mob murder on all sorts of pretexts, a guarantee of justice in the courts, and establishment of the right to vote, subject to an educational qualification honestly administered, but, in the case of those who fought in the war, free of even this restriction. These are in the main fundamentals guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens, irrespective of their color. There is no special privilege or favor included in them. They are the minimum without which no similar group of white people would remain content and at peace for a single hour. There are now ten millions of the colored people—ten millions of unhappy, discontented Americans. They ask nothing else than to be good Americans, but they will not wait much longer to be led. It is idle to put upon any group of agitators the responsibility for their discontent. The moment it was decreed that they should learn the alphabet, it was decreed that there should be discontent. It is a just and divine discontent.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Reason in Revolution

THE whole world is seething with labor unrest. Six million young men lie in premature graves, and four old men sit in Paris partitioning the earth. Meanwhile, the world over, simple men, disillusioned and distrustful of all the fine phrases of politicians, weary of the slaughter and the starvation and the lying and the monstrous wickedness of the war, suspicious of the industrial system out of which it sprang, tired of political chicanery and pretence, growingly conscious of their own united power and increasingly aware of the appalling inadequacy and blindness of their so-called leaders—today the simple men who work, but do not write or talk overmuch, are evidencing a disconcerting readiness to try for a new social order. In Russia we confront a would-be communist republic; in every country a frankly revolutionary social movement. The situation is profoundly disturbing, and not only to the holders of privilege, or to those who believe that men are not to be kept in order except by night-sticks and rifles. Small wonder that such stand darkly behind their riot guns, inviting the catastrophe they would avoid. But as for the rest of us, is the future really so threatening? Not if we front it clear-eyed and unafraid.

What are the world's working men demanding? In Russia and the defeated empires they rose asking for peace and land and bread and the direction of their own lives—no more, no less. Who should deny them that? Yet, because they were denied, they overthrew their rulers, and seized much of what the law had once guaranteed to others. In France, half a million workers are on strike, demanding in the first instance an eight-hour day, and higher wages to meet impossible living costs. Their rulers giving no aid, they threaten with overthrow the arch-imperialist who has been the evil genius of the Peace Conference. In England, the tricky Lloyd George Government hears rumblings of a general strike—involving what issues? Withdrawal of Allied troops from Russia, the raising of the monstrously wicked blockade, the abolition of conscription, which has cursed the world for a half-century, and the release of conscientious objectors. The policemen threaten a strike in order to secure recognition of their union and to prevent the militarization of the force. The discharged soldiers, only a few weeks since counted on to break up labor meetings, now stand with industrial labor. They ask for—work, and the Government gives them—evasions. In far South Africa, the tramway workers, after expressing their disgust with the inefficiency of the Town Council as an industrial agency and threatening to run the lines themselves, have apparently secured a commission to examine the whole question of municipal government machinery. Buenos Ayres for months has been experiencing disturbances which seem to involve larger labor control in industrial affairs. The great Canadian strike, beginning as a protest against exorbitant living costs and shameless war profiteering, and centring on the eight-hour day, the forty-four hour week, and the right of collective bargaining, has become involved with the problem of the One Big Union and all the revolutionary issues connected with it. The telegraph strike with which Americans stand face to face is declared to be a move against industrial autocracy, whether exercised by a private corporation or by an overbearing Postmaster General. What may grow out of it, none can tell.

Examining without prejudice the demands that underlie these worldwide disturbances, one is obliged to admit that for the most part they constitute a protest against conditions that ought not to exist. We do not mean that every specific demand is justified under the specific circumstances. We do not maintain that laborers are more righteous than their employers. We do mean that generally at the present time the workers are asking in the first instance essentially what human beings ought to demand—decent pay and living conditions, reasonable leisure, a voice in fixing the conditions of their own life and work, and honesty and humanity in the relations of Governments and peoples. The fundamental instincts of plain men, if unperverted, are, we believe, sound and decent and humane. It is those instincts that underlie the present uprising of labor, and not simply a mad desire to pillage and destroy. To the man of faith and courage there is indeed something vastly inspiring, rather than terrifying, in a world filled with common men who believe it actually possible at last that their fundamental human instincts can be satisfied, and who are quietly determined to create a world in which such satisfaction may be assured. The present situation, therefore, for all its perplexity, its uncertainty, and its revolutionary aspect, is one for cheer and hopefulness and thoughtful planning, rather than for fear and uncritical, unseeing opposition.

Such opposition, indeed, constitutes perhaps the gravest danger with which we are faced. A dispatch of June 6 reported that "strengthening of Winnipeg's police force by 1,000 constables caused an increase during the night in minor disturbances and personal encounters"—though why an increase of the police force should result in an increase of disorder is a puzzle seeming to need explanation. The testimony from Seattle, Lawrence, Winnipeg, Paris, and most other centres of labor trouble during recent months has been all to one effect—the great body of the workers, despite the example of their Governments during the years just past, or perhaps just because of that example, appear to have little inclination to use violence. Individuals and small groups preach force, and repression always plays into their hands. But even today the ordinary worker, quietly looking for revolutionary change, is a man of peace, seeking simple, wholesome satisfactions in simple and direct fashion. Just because he is a man of peace, because his demands on life are simple, because his action is direct and honest, the future, which rests in his hands, is full of hope, provided only the present holders of power and privilege will not insist on facing him with the machine gun. The "dictatorship of the proletariat" which swims so horrendously before their eyes is to be, in reality, if they will let it, not an orgy of loot and murder, but a reasonable and peaceful readjustment of institutions and relationships so as to make possible, for the first time in the world's history, the reasonable satisfaction of the reasonable wants of the common man. It is such a development that the present demands of labor forecast, if we look at them soberly, apart from the excitements of the hour. It is not repression, therefore, that the rulers of states should employ today. Instead, they should open wide the channels of discussion and orderly action, through which the currents of normal thought and mass impulse may flow more freely. Granted such liberty, we may safely trust unspoiled human nature for the rest, and may look forward with distinct confidence to an era of social harmony and individual wellbeing. It is a time for hope and thought.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Industrial Unrest*

By BASIL MANLY

WE are about to enter a period of the most acute industrial unrest and the most bitter industrial controversy that the American nation has ever known. Unless effective and radical steps are taken to bring about a better understanding between labor and capital and to establish an equitable basis for orderly industrial progress, we are certain to see within the next year strikes and mass movements of labor beside which all previous American strikes will pale into insignificance. Since the signing of the armistice we have had a large number of small strikes and a few great spectacular ones—the Seattle strike, the New York harbor strike, the Lawrence strike, the Toledo strike, and a number of others of lesser consequence. But these have been so limited in comparison with the labor upheavals in other countries—in England, in Germany, in Canada, in Australia, and in the Argentine—that there has been a public disposition to regard the industrial situation with complacency and to assume that, having passed through the first part of the period of transition without serious industrial disturbances, we were about to enter an era of industrial peace.

Those who take this complacent attitude are deceiving themselves. Since the armistice, American labor has been waiting. It has been waiting because the outstanding leader of the American labor movement, Samuel Gompers, was on an important Government mission in Europe. It has been waiting because the American labor movement, expecting the war to continue much longer, had not formulated its definite policy. Labor has been waiting also for the completion of the demobilization of troops and for the transition of our factories from war production to peace production. The period of waiting is now nearly completed. The demobilization is nearing an end. Our industries are beginning to swing into their normal production, and next week, here in Atlantic City, there will be formulated, at the convention of the American Federation of Labor, a definite policy for the American labor movement. I am making no threat that Bolshevism or Spartacanism is about to sweep the United States. The American labor movement will not go Bolshevik unless it is driven to that course by the goadings of selfish and unenlightened capitalists and capitalistic agents.

Those who regard the American industrial situation with complacency ignore both the psychology of the workers and the compelling facts. The workers of the Allied world have been told that they were engaged in a war for democracy; that out of the ruins of the war would arise a new and more beautiful world. They are asking now, "Where is that democracy for which we fought? When are we to enter into this new world with its greater regard for the rights of the common man?" They see no change for the better, but they find themselves in conditions in many respects worse than those against which they protested before we entered the war. The masses of the people are being rapidly disillusioned, and when the people lose their illusions there is danger ahead. They have seen the prices of nearly every commodity, including rents, advance so far beyond the increases which they have secured in their weekly wages since the beginning of the war that they are now actually able to buy less of the necessities of life than before the war began. There are exceptions, it is true, where the percentage of wage increase has been greater, but, if you will examine these cases of unusual increases as I have examined them, you will find that in a majority of instances those increases have come to groups of workers who are admitted, even by their employers, to have been underpaid during the pre-war period.

During the war, it is true, the increases in prices were in a measure compensated for by the greater steadiness of employment and by the frequency of opportunities for overtime, as well as for large earnings at piece work. But that time is now past, and the mass of American workers, I say with some degree of assurance, is actually able to purchase less of the necessities and comforts of life with the wages which they receive today than they were able to buy with the wages which they received before the beginning of the world war. No hope is held out to them of relief from this condition through a rapid or even a gradual recession of prices. Judge Gary tells us that prices will remain high over a long period of years. Otto H. Kahn, the spokesman for the American bankers, tells us the same thing, and Julius H. Barnes, formerly an operator in the Chicago grain pit, and now successor to Herbert Hoover, tells us that there is no hope for cheaper bread.

But it is not merely that the cost of living is high and beyond the capacity of the wage-earner's pocket book. This might be endured with some degree of patience and fortitude if the people who toiled believed that no one was profiting from their necessities, and that all were bearing the burden alike. But they have seen with their own eyes and heard with their own ears of the unconscionable profiteering of American corporations during the war, and they know that that same profiteering is now continuing unabated. I have just completed a study of the earnings of eighty-two representative American corporations, a record of whose profits is available for each year from 1911 through 1918. This is not a list selected either because the profits were large or because the profits were small. It is a list of all the corporations whose earnings covering this entire period were available to me. A compilation of these figures shows that the same eighty-two corporations which, in the pre-war years, had an average net income of $325,000,000, had net incomes in 1916 amounting to more than $1,000,000,000, in 1917 of $975,000,000, and in 1918 of $736,000,000. This is after the deduction of every dollar of State and Federal taxes, and of every conceivable charge which these companies could devise for reducing and concealing their apparent profits.

I am convinced as a result of my study that the actual profits even after the payment of taxes in 1917 and 1918 were just as great as in 1916, the difference being accounted for by the fact that in 1917 and 1918 these corporations set up all kinds of excessive reserves for depreciation, amortization, and other unspecified and fanciful contingencies, for the purpose of evading taxation and concealing their excessive earnings from the public and the tax collector. But even taking the figures as they stand, we find that these eighty-two corporations earned, net, three dollars in 1916

*A paper read before the National Conference of Social Work at Atlantic City on June 2, and here printed, by courtesy of the Conference, in advance of publication in the *Proceedings* of that body.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and 1917, and over two dollars in 1918, for every dollar which they earned in the pre-war period. This is profiteering with a vengeance, and the profiteers may well tremble lest the people avenge themselves for this shameless exploitation during a period of the nation's greatest necessity.

Yet, with the people, and particularly the workers, in a state of exasperation as a result of their daily struggle with an unjustly inflated cost of living, attempts are already being made by selfish and foolish employers to reduce wages. Sometimes these attempts to reduce wages are made directly, but far more often by the device of shutting down the plants for a short period to repair the ravages of high-speed war production and then employing new men at reduced rates. There were indications at the recent convention of the National Association of Manufacturers that a concerted movement to reduce wages would be made by a large group of American manufacturers. The men who banqueted so sumptuously at the Waldorf Astoria while they concocted their plans for widespread reductions in wages were playing with dynamite, and dynamite infinitely more dangerous, both to the capitalists and to the public, than all the May Day bomb plots of anarchists.

American labor, whether organized or unorganized, will bitterly and effectively resist any such attempt to reduce wages until the price level has dropped far lower than it is today. Labor knows its advantages, and it knows now, as it has never known before, its stupendous power. All intelligent labor leaders know, even if the manufacturers appear not to know, that for the next generation there is to be a world-wide labor shortage, and that this shortage is almost certain to be greatest in America. They know that more than seven million men were killed in the war and that even a greater number were incapacitated. They know that there has been virtually no immigration to the United States since July, 1914, and that there is likely to be little in the years to come. They know that emigrants are leaving the United States in such great numbers that the American Bankers Association has passed resolutions directing national attention to this phenomenon.

Wise men know also that the labor movement has greatly increased its strength in recent years. At least two million men have been added to the ranks of organized labor in America during the war. A million have been organized on the railways alone, and more than a million have been added to the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor in other branches of industry. American labor is more conscious than ever before of its power and of its rights. It will demand the abolition of age-old injustices. Labor has been in the harness for untold centuries. The harness has become heavy and galling, but labor does not now ask that the harness be lightened or that the share of oats and hay be enlarged. Labor now demands the right to climb into the driver's seat and help control the machinery which draws the lumbering chariot of modern industry.

The President of the United States and all other enlightened citizens recognize that this new status which labor is demanding will either be granted graciously or will be won after industrial battles of a severity and extent which wise men seek to avoid. But individual employers and financiers are still unenlightened. They believe that what has been will be, and that there is no new thing under the sun. In a recent issue of *Law and Labor*, the organ of the American Anti-Boycott Association, it is shown that one-third of its membership of American manufacturers is opposed to any form of collective dealing with employees, even though they are unorganized and have no assistance from outside trade unions. The National Association of Manufacturers apparently expects to return to ante-bellum standards.

There is an active minority of powerful capitalists and employers intent upon establishing in the United States a dictatorship of the plutocracy. There is an equally active and even more determined minority on the labor side determined to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat. Neither can succeed except by wrecking the existing industrial and social structure of the United States. We cannot have either a dictatorship of the plutocracy or a dictatorship of the proletariat except upon the ruins of American industry. If we are to save ourselves, if we are to save American productive industry and American social life from disaster, we must find a method and a means of orderly progress to the new status and new conditions which the workers of America have been promised and now demand.

This does not seem to be possible through our existing political institutions. There is no hope for orderly industrial and social progress through the present Congress. The Sixty-Sixth Congress of the United States is the least enlightened, the most reactionary Congress, that this generation has known. I do not except even the dark days of Cannonism and the Payne-Aldrich tariff. The present Congress contains as many hard-shelled fossils as Messrs. Cannon and Aldrich numbered among their supporters. But this Congress has no group of young, hard-hitting progressives such as deposed Mr. Cannon from the Speaker's chair and all but defeated Mr. Aldrich in the Senate. The progressives now in Congress are relatively old men, tired with twenty years of hard fighting. They have not quit fighting and they have not lost their ideals, but they have lost their old punch and aggressiveness.

There is another reason why we can hope for nothing through the ordinary political machinery. That is the Espionage Law, which has thrown a few brave men into jail for voicing protests against existing conditions, and has terrorized countless thousands into ignominious silence. The Espionage Act was bad enough under war conditions. It is infinitely worse to continue it on the statute books since the signing of the armistice. It will be an outrage to enact any such legislation to apply to peace times. But I am informed that a majority of the reactionaries of the House and Senate are intent upon the enactment of statutes of suppression or oppression more stringent even than the war-time Espionage Act. I have faith that President Wilson will veto any such Federal legislation. But I see, with equally great alarm, that some of the States have already enacted vicious legislation of this character, and I am informed that the predatory interests are determined and have the power to put such bills through the legislatures of, perhaps, a majority of the States and to secure their approval by the governors of those States. The suppression of free discussion during a critical period such as we are now entering upon is of the greatest danger to the very life of the nation. There must be a safety valve of free speech and free assemblage if we are to escape the destructive explosions which a policy of suppressions and coercion will render inevitable. The present Espionage Act should be repealed and every State should purge its statute books of every such act limiting the rights of its citizens.

Although the possibility of orderly industrial and social progress through our political institutions thus seems to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be remote, it is altogether possible that we shall find other means of reaching the same end. What we need is a national understanding, not of politicians, but of people. There is no reason why such an understanding as is necessary to avert the catastrophe which seems to be impending cannot be reached by those leaders who much more directly and truly represent the people than the men who sit in Congress. I mean that through a national conference of the representatives of labor and of capital, with proper representation of those public groups which have no direct affiliation with or dependence upon either labor or capital, an effective understanding can be reached which will provide the means for orderly progress toward better conditions and better relations between all groups of American society. This is the method which England was forced to adopt when, according to Frank A. Vanderlip, she was threatened with impending revolution. Premier Lloyd George did not then go to Parliament for a solution. Instead, he summoned an industrial parliament made up of several hundred leaders of British industry. They reached an understanding and the British revolution was averted. Some weeks ago the cables carried an intimation that President Wilson contemplated the adoption of some such method of dealing with the industrial situation in the United States. It is true that this was not specifically confirmed by the President's message to Congress, but a message to Congress was obviously no place for the President to reveal any plans which he might have for such an extra-legal method of procedure. I do not doubt, therefore, that when the President returns and finds the nation confronted, as it seems now inevitable that it will be, with actual or impending industrial controversies which threaten national stagnation, he will turn to the device which has proved so effective in England, and summon, first, a small conference of the outstanding leaders of American labor and the great financiers who control industrial capital, to be followed by a great industrial congress embracing leaders from all industries and from all sections of the country.

We are told by pessimists that such conferences and that such a congress would result only in endless talk and final disagreement. I cannot accept that view. I cannot believe that the great American financiers are such fools that they will risk the possible destruction of all that they possess and control rather than make concessions which will satisfy the fair-minded majority who form the strength of the American labor movement. Nor do I believe that the leaders of American labor will press their demands so hard that an agreement will be impossible. If this congress were to be made up of provincial labor leaders and of employers whose knowledge and interest do not extend beyond the front doors of their own small shops, agreement might be difficult, if not impossible, but if the conference and congress are made up, as I trust they will be, of men accustomed to deal with large affairs in a large way, I am confident that the result will be an understanding and an enunciation of principles and policies far more effective for orderly progress than any legislation. I love America. I foresee troublous times confronting her, but I have faith in the American people and am confident that out of the turmoil and dissension which are ahead will come a better understanding among all groups and all classes, from which will be evolved a life of greater comfort and happiness for all the people of America and the basis for that citizenship which alone makes a nation truly great.

The Great Winnipeg Strike

By J. A. STEVENSON

THE facts of the great general strike in Winnipeg which has evoked sympathetic response from the majority of industrial centres in Canada are already known to the majority of the readers of the *Nation*, though possibly, since the censorship of the strikers has been evaded, the anti-labor case has received more adequate presentation to the American public. The basic facts of the situation are, that for the last three weeks a state of peaceful civil war has been in existence in the city of Winnipeg, which, springing up around the old Hudson Bay trading post of Fort Garry after 1875, is now, with a population of 200,000, the commercial and financial capital of Western Canada. On the one side are thirty thousand strikers with their families and dependents, and on the other are the employers and upper classes, with most of the bourgeois element, under the leadership of the Citizens' Committee of One Thousand. The original dispute between the employers and employees in the metal and building trades over the questions of wages and collective bargaining has been lost sight of in the wider claim of the labor leaders that the working classes must have some real control over their destinies, and an adequate guarantee of an existence which will not be a continual financial crisis for themselves and their families. The Citizens' Committee, on the other hand, maintain that the labor leaders contemplated and planned a *coup d'état* to overturn the established order of society and force a Bolshevist revolution, and that only the determined front presented by their own organization thwarted this terrible programme. They insist that the issue now up for decision is the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that while the majority of the rank and file of labor have been misled by agitators and visionaries, yet in point of fact Bolshevism raw and naked is the ideal which they are combating. To the number of six thousand they have been drilling in the ranks of the militia regiments, prepared to die rather than bow before the doctrines of Lenine and Trotzky. The implication has been sedulously spread abroad that alien enemies and revolutionaries are at the root of the trouble, but it is notorious that the chief strike leaders, Messrs. Russell, Winning, and Ivens, the latter a Methodist ex-clergyman who was expelled from his church for his pacifist views, and has since been editing the *Western Labor News*, are all British-born. Major Andrews, D.S.O., the Unionist member for Centre Winnipeg, who won in 1917 against a labor candidate, surprised the House of Commons on June 2, by this courageous statement concerning the strike leaders and their aims:

> These are the men who, today, are on strike. There is certainly something wrong somewhere. In addition to those men, as good and as loyal citizens as Canada ever had, there are many of my own comrades who stood in the trenches in France; they are on strike. I say, standing in my place here, that eighty per cent. of the returned men of Winnipeg are in sympathy with the strikers and the object of this strike. . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is another point I want to touch upon for a moment or two. Twice this afternoon I have heard the term "Bolsheviks" applied to the strike leaders in Winnipeg. Gentlemen, if you apply the term to those men, you apply it to me, because they are my friends. There is a man called James Winning, a good, level-headed Scotchman, who has spent practically all his life working for his fellow men. . . . If ever a strike by workingmen in newspaper offices was justified, it was in this case if the newspapers were not playing the game. There is another man called Russell in Winnipeg. Russell is a socialist and not a man who advocates force. I know these men, and for them force would be absolutely the last resource. Russell wants a change. So does Robinson, so does Simpson, and so does Rigg. They want a change because they are not satisfied with present conditions. How many honorable gentlemen in this House are satisfied?

The attitude of the returned soldiers, who number many thousands in Winnipeg and who have been extremely critical of the alien element in their midst, is sufficient guarantee of the *bona fides* of the strike movement. An attempt was made to induce the Great War Veterans Association to pass a resolution condemning the strike, but its promoters succeeded only in extracting from a mass meeting of the veterans a vote expressing a general sympathy with the objects of the strike. The veterans, furthermore, almost to a man declined to rejoin the militia regiments, and recently a body of them, one thousand strong, paraded to the local parliament buildings to demand legislation conceding most of the strikers' claims. Many of the veterans are at present living on liberal war gratuities and if such is their present temper, what will be their attitude when they find themselves faced with the conditions which have been confronting the average worker in Canada for some months?

The Winnipeg strike is one of the opening rounds of a conflict which will soon become universal in all countries, whether victorious or vanquished in the war. Professor Veblen, in his *Inquiry Into the Nature of Peace and the Terms of Its Perpetuation*, prophesied in 1916 that the conclusion of a political peace at large was the one thing necessary to usher in a bitter social and economic conflict inside all the warring countries. It came to a head first in Russia on account of the abandoned corruption and misgovernment attendant on an outworn institution, the Czardom and its servile bureaucracy. Among the Anglo-Saxon countries a really acute stage has been reached first in Canada for a variety of reasons. A large part of her industrial life is purely artificial, a hot-house growth produced by high tariffs, and the fund available in normal times for distribution between capital and labor employed in industry is comparatively limited. Stock watering has been indulged in to a disgraceful extent, almost unprecedented in the annals of American finance, and capital unblushingly expects both labor and consumer to make sacrifices for the payment of dividends on notoriously inflated values. Again, nowhere has class privilege been allowed to dominate the management of war finance to the same degree. Professor O. D. Skelton of Queens University, the ablest political economist in Canada, last year published the following table showing how bad, from a democratic point of view, are the methods of the Canadian finance minister, as compared with the fiscal policies of Great Britain and the United States. In it he sets forth the proportion of taxes levied respectively on property and income and those on consumption, the latter being obviously more burdensome to the working classes.

	Taxes on Property and Income		Taxes on Consumption	
Year	Amount	Per cent.	Amount	Per cent.
Great Britain				
1915-16	£163,000,000	56	£128,000,000	44
1916-17	379,000,000	74	135,000,000	36
1917-18	495,000,000	81	118,000,000	19
United States				
1916-17	$125,000,000	17	$601,000,000	83
1917-18	3,321,000,000	80	795,000,000	20
Canada				
1915-16	$1,200,000	1	$123,400,000	99
1916-17	13,800,000	8	160,900,000	92
1917-18	22,300,000	11	175,700,000	89

Since the war began, Canada has raised only a beggarly eighty million dollars by direct taxation. If she had taxed on the scale of New Zealand, another British Dominion, she could have secured at least two hundred and fifty millions, and could have effected large reductions in her consumption levies.

The figures furnished by the Dominion Statistical Department as late as February 15, 1919, also show the Canadian workman to be in a much worse position than his American brother. The following are some examples of comparative prices in a list of food commodities at Winnipeg and St. Paul.

	Winnipeg	St. Paul
Prunes, lb. (cents)	23	19.4
Coffee, lb.	41.5	36.3
Tea, lb.	65	58.3
Sugar, lb.	12.5	11.1
Corn, per can	23	17.9

On the other hand, there is a very decided inferiority in the Canadian artisan's rates of pay, according to the comparative statement of wages in fifteen specified occupations of which the following six may be taken as typical:

	Canada	U. S.
Blacksmiths (cents per hour)	57.8	68.3
Bricklayers	63.5	81.2
Carpenters	51	62.7
Moulders	53	56.9
Plumbers	55.5	77
Sheet Metal Workers	55.3	65.1

Within recent weeks prices have taken a further bound. Eggs, for instance, are at seventy cents per dozen, and clothing has reached almost famine prices, while the Dominion Textile Company announces a thirty-one per cent. dividend on stock originally valued at ten dollars a share, and held at one hundred and ten dollars today. It is well known that the packing companies and cold-storage firms are exporting enormous quantities of food, and that Canadian prices are being fixed by the needs and demands of starving Europe. The knowledge, too, that the richer classes had in many cases enormously increased their fortunes by war profits and had been offered by their generous friend, Sir Thomas White, an easy avenue to escape their proper share of taxation by investment in tax-free bonds, added fuel to the flames.

Another contributing factor was the deplorable weakness of the Liberal opposition in Parliament. Its leader (happily temporary), Mr. D. D. MacKenzie, is, as Sir Robert Borden truly said, the finest example of crusted Toryism in the House; for example, he has recently declared himself not only an avowed protectionist but also an advocate of legislation to make strikes illegal, and his leadership has reduced the efforts of the Opposition to a farce. When there is an active Parliamentary opposition, assailing the Government

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for its misdeeds at every turn, exposing abuses and setting before the public programmes of reform, discontent in the country is often ready to confine itself to applauding and supporting these anti-governmental efforts, especially if they are conducted with vigor and obvious sincerity. But when a country has, like Canada today, an Administration which connives at the worst forms of profiteering, alleviates the proper burdens of the "classes" at the expense of the masses, and devotes most of its energy to awarding outrageous contracts to its plutocratic backers, and the Opposition either condones or protests feebly against the most glaring offences, direct action on the part of the workmen is an inevitable consequence. Travellers from Winnipeg report that even among the Citizens' Committee great sympathy is expressed with the economic plight of the workers, and that there is an openly expressed determination, as soon as the strike has been defeated, to set about the demolition of the present Federal Government by constitutional methods. If, however, the strikers of Winnipeg planned a real Bolshevist revolution, they must be innocent visionaries. Canada is the last place in Anglo-Saxondom where a revolt of the proletariat, aiming at communism, has a reasonable chance of success. Almost one-half of the population are individualist farmers owning their own land, and forty-two per cent. give devout allegiance to the Catholic Church, which under French Canadian leadership shudders at the word "socialism," and is still appalled at the radical reconstruction programme endorsed by American leaders of Catholicism.

Despite the sympathetic response from other quarters of the Dominion, it is highly probably that the Winnipeg strikers will have to acknowledge a partial defeat for the time being. Various unions have already capitulated. The daily papers have resumed publication and the city Administration is beginning to function once more. There seems a disposition to accept an offer of mediation made by the Railway Brotherhoods. Some of the demands of the strikers will doubtless be conceded, but, in the main, victory will rest with the Citizens' Committee, who, despite their wild extravagances and anti-Bolshevist panics, have generated a remarkable display of community spirit. It would have delighted the heart of William James to see real estate magnates and millionaires of the grain exchange performing menial tasks like emptying garbage cans and cutting boulevards, and the general effect upon these men will be beneficial. Whether the strike fails or not, the results will be far-reaching. In the first place it has given to the people of Canada and the citizens of Winnipeg in particular a first-rate course of instruction in labor problems. During the last three weeks Winnipeggers, cut off from all papers and letters, and in many cases from business activities, have had ample leisure to read the *Western Labor News* and to discuss the whole range of the social and industrial problem, and they now know something about collective bargaining and other kindred matters, as well as the struggle which most workers and their families have to face. Outside Winnipeg, similar results are visible, because public attention was keenly concentrated on the Winnipeg situation. Second, the crisis has at last forced the Federal Government to appoint a parliamentary commission to investigate the high cost of living and its causes, and it will compel them to initiate a definite industrial policy, once the Mathers commission, which is now peregrinating the country, makes its report. Third, it has taught the workers that if they confine themselves to purely industrial action, sooner or later their efforts will be blocked by the power of the state, and that, as Mr. J. H. Thomas lately told an American labor audience, unless they desire to fight with one hand tied behind their backs, steps must be taken to insure political as a corollary to economic action. Every intelligent person in Canada, including Sir Robert Borden, is now agreed that the Canadian House of Commons would be immensely improved in authority and capacity by the presence of a score of labor representatives, and in the debate on industrial unrest on June 2, Mr. W. W. Buchanan, M.P., emphasized the need for proportional representation—a movement which is making some headway.

The political effects of the strike cannot fail to be far reaching. It means the eventual overthrow of the Union Government, for labor will not forgive its attempts at strike breaking. The farmers and French Canadians are already frankly hostile to it for other reasons, and no Canadian Government can have a long existence merely on the support of the plutocracy and the urban bourgeoisie. Henceforth the urban vote will be divided into two camps, labor and anti-labor, and the possibility of the revival of Liberalism as a moderating force is considerably lessened. There is no disposition to accept as a panacea for our social and economic troubles the naïve advice tendered by a certain Lady Pope to the convention of that amazing society, the Daughters of the Empire, at Montreal. In view of the prevailing unrest she counselled her hearers in sublime and perfect seriousness to make a point when they passed a workman to say, "It is a hot morning" (or a cold morning, as the case might be), and when riding to the theatre, bejewelled and bedecked, to keep the lights of their limousines darkened. No other pronouncement has lately aroused quite so much hilarity in Canada. But in the search for a more serious solution, the crisis is leading more and more people to look for salvation to the strong agrarian movement which has been gathering strength since December, 1918. It is set forth in the Farmers' Platform, or, as they prefer to call it, "The New National Policy"—a more radical programme than any hitherto offered to the Canadian people. The farmers are radical reformers with the brake of the conservatism of property owners. They ought to be able, with the help of labor and some assistance from liberals among the educated classes, to end the unfortunate dominance of our plutocratic interests, who were never more arrogant and predacious than at present, and to offer Canada a reasonable alternative to a Bolshevist revolution.

Contributors to this Issue

BASIL MANLY, formerly chief investigator for the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations, and now joint chairman of the War Labor Board, possesses an almost unique knowledge of the American labor world.

J. A. STEVENSON, Ottawa correspondent of the *Nation*, has enjoyed, in connection with his work for the Canadian Government, special opportunities for making a thorough study of conditions in Western Canada.

HERBERT J. SELIGMANN is a journalist who has made a special study of the present race situation in the South.

CARL BECKER is professor of modern European history in Cornell University.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Protecting Southern Womanhood

By HERBERT J. SELIGMANN

A REVEALING chapter of American history is yet to be written on the methods employed to "protect Southern womanhood." Those methods have included in the past two months an orgy of men and women about a dying human being whose legs slowly burned as a rope strangled him and fifty bullets entered his body; they have included the murder of innocent men without trial; they have included the invasion of a hospital by a mob, resulting in the death of a patient just operated upon; they have included the forcible removal from a railway car and the murder of an innocent man whose leg had just been amputated in the hospital from which he was being transported. For the benefit of those unfamiliar with the increasingly popular sport of "protecting Southern womanhood" it should be noted that the objects of this sport are usually United States citizens of dark skin—Negroes.

We learn from the editorial page of the *Vicksburg Weekly Herald* of May 16 that the sport in Vicksburg, where it claimed an innocent victim nineteen years old, was stimulated by a country-wide campaign for equal rights for United States citizens (Negro). We learn that published reports of that campaign acted "like oil on fire" in Vicksburg, where a human being (Negro) was roasted amid "the fiendish gloating" of a mob, to quote a local newspaper, of 1,500 persons, some of the spectators being women (white). We learn from the columns of the *New Orleans Times-Picayune* of May 12 that the sport received a special impetus in the case of a Negro artisan who was so skilled in his occupation that he competed successfully with white men who resented his success. From a study of authenticated cases it would seem that where there is a white man to be shielded from the consequences of wrongdoing, where a Negro is a rival in trade or business of white men, where a Negro attempts to change his status from that of laborer to property owner and farmer, or where a Negro falls under suspicion of attempting to exercise the functions of a citizen guaranteed him by the Federal Constitution, there stares him in the face the danger that he will be done to death in any one of a number of hideous ways by a mob of white men intent upon "protecting Southern womanhood."

It is instructive to note the attitude of some Southern women toward the measures undertaken for their protection. The *New Orleans Item* of May 21 published a news paragraph to the effect that "a resolution of protest against lynch law and other mob demonstrations was defeated by the chapter [of the United Daughters of the Confederacy] whose members said the matter was political and should not be taken up by them." It might, to the uninitiated outsider, seem strange that there could be anything political about the protection of Southern womanhood. But let him talk to some citizens, let us say, of the Delta region in Mississippi, and he will be enlightened. He will learn first that mob murder is necessary to protect wives and daughters from "burly black brutes." If he ventures the information that of 2,522 cases of lynching of Negroes in the last thirty years only 477 were ascribed to rape and 237 to attacks upon women, and that in that period 210 were murdered by mobs for crimes against property, the reply will perhaps be that lynching is necessary to "keep the niggers in their place." To that uninitiated outsider it might seem that frequent mob murders, less than one-third of which are even attributed to offences against women, constitute an expensive way to protect Southern womanhood. A recital, in detail, of one or two cases, will perhaps serve to make the point sufficiently clear.

George Bolden (Negro) was accused of "writing an insulting note to a white woman" in the town of Monroe, Louisiana. Responsible citizens of the town testified that he could not write and that he had had to make a "cross mark" when he indorsed checks payable by them to him. Nevertheless a mob shot him and left him for dead. He was carried to the hospital, where his leg was amputated in consequence of the injuries which the mob had inflicted. Learning he was in the hospital, the mob, despite the protest of the nurses, invaded a ward filled with patients, some of whom were critically ill, "one having just undergone an operation." They seized this man (Negro) "but discovered their mistake and left him." He died of shock the following day. Bolden, his leg amputated, was turned over the next day to his wife, who was advised to take him to Shreveport. The mob boarded the train on which he lay in the baggage car. Near Cheniere, eight miles west of Monroe, one of their number pulled the bell cord, stopping the train. "As the train slowed down," says the reporter for the *New Orleans Times-Picayune* of May 12, "the mob rushed into the baggage car and threw the Negro off . . . Bolden's body literally was riddled with bullets."

And now for the protection of Southern womanhood which occasioned the murder. "Reports are also in circulation," says the *Times-Picayune*, "to the effect that Bolden, who was skilled in certain lines of work, had incurred the enmity of a small coterie of white men who are said to object to Negroes being employed at trades that require skill, and that one of the white men in this coterie wrote the note to the white woman and signed Bolden's name to it."

Southern womanhood was again protected in Vicksburg on May 14. A young white woman of that city, Mattie Hudson, eighteen years old, living on Second North Street, screamed at five o'clock that morning and said she had waked to find a Negro in her bed. The man escaped. At ten o'clock, two bloodhounds from Crystal Springs, Mississippi, were baying down a street inhabited by Negroes. Every Negro man then at home knew that if one of those dogs stopped at his door he would be murdered by a mob without having opportunity to explain. One Negro who watched the dogs from his place of hiding informed the writer that they started toward the steps of a white man's house in First North Street but were pulled back by their owner, Gantt, who held them in long leashes. The dogs, according to the *Vicksburg Evening Post* of May 14, "failed to locate the man wanted," and "wound up aimlessly at the restaurant near the A. & V. railroad station." After a second hunt with the dogs, in which they took a different route, Lloyd Clay, nineteen years old, was arrested. He had come downstairs to see what caused the disturbance outside his house. His younger brother, aged seventeen, testified that Lloyd had slept in the same room with him the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entire night. Lloyd Clay was favorably known. His family had lived in Vicksburg for several generations and bore a good name. "Brought before Miss Hudson, she declared he was not the man who attacked her last night," said the *Vicksburg Evening Post.*

One of the men whom Miss Hudson "positively identified" subsequently, had been in jail for several days preceding, and on the day of the attack. From eleven o'clock in the morning a crowd stood about the jail to which Clay had been taken. Men made speeches, waved handkerchiefs, shouted themselves hoarse. But, when at 7.45 that evening a fifteen-foot steel rail, ninety pounds to the foot, smashed in a barred window of the jail, when, amid the howls and frenzied joy of 1,500 citizens of Vicksburg, Lloyd Clay was dragged from his cell, trampled upon and brutally mistreated in a truck which took him to the fashionable residence street, Clay Street, to be tortured to death, Sheriff Frank Scott, Chief of Police R. G. Groome, and his fourteen armed policemen "registered surprise." They need not have taken the trouble. It was well known that not one shot would be fired in defence of the prisoner. Policeman Number 14 unwittingly corroborated this fact to the writer.

The mob that murdered Clay was an "amateur organization," according to the *Vicksburg Evening Post.* "They picked the first tree which came handy and which, unfortunately, was in the center of the city, surrounded by the residences of citizens whose sensibilities were shocked by the occurrence."

The mob first attended to the identification. Miss Hudson, being protected, was brought to the corner of Farmer and Clay streets, in Vicksburg's residential district. "Shouts, howls, and the screech of motor horns made a deafening sound. In the midst of this confusion the men brought Clay to Miss Hudson." It will be remembered that she had said he was not the man. But here was a howling mob, thirsting for the blood that would protect Southern womanhood. "Is that the man?" they shouted at Miss Hudson. "Say the word," shouted others. Miss Hudson said the word. The following passages are taken from the first page of the *Vicksburg Evening Post:*

> The mob fell upon the Negro, snatching away his clothes and beating him. He was dragged further toward First North. "Shall we do it?" asked a big man of the crowd. The answer came in long continued cheers of approval. . . . The Negro was hauled up five feet but slipped back. The sight of the nude body rising above the crowd increased the excitement. . . . "Shoot him," someone called. "No, no," came the answer, "let him die slow." The Negro, with head twisted, dangled limply from the line. Seeing that Clay was merely suffering discomfort, men below began to jerk his legs. Others smeared kerosene upon the body, while others prepared a bonfire below, saturating the material with gasoline. . . . The flesh on the body began to crinkle and blister. The face of the Negro became horribly distorted with pain. He assumed an attitude of prayer, raising his hands' palms together. . . . The legs of the corpse curled backward grewsomely. . . . The grizzly form was allowed to dangle for an hour and a half in the moonlight. . . . Men of all classes, women, and even children witnessed the scene. The whole affair had been witnessed by many ladies who followed the mob from the jail and others who joined the crowd on the terraces nearby. . . . When the body fell to the gutter there was a great rush for bits of rope as souvenirs.

Coroner Crichlow's jury, daunted at the prospect of indicting 1,500 citizens of Vicksburg "of all classes," found that Lloyd Clay met his death by mob violence, "the said mob being unknown to this jury," and the following jurors signed the inquest papers: J. G. Sherard, E. W. Halpin, J. A. Harzer, R. Quin Smith, W. D. Beard, Will De Jong.

Lest there be doubt as to the motive of the mob, I quote the remark of a man made in reply to the request of Mrs. Ida M. Keefe that the tree on which Clay was hung in front of her house be cut down. "Madam," said the man, "the tree is a monument to the spirit of manhood of this community who will not tolerate crimes against their women folks. What was done here last night was done for you and for every woman and girl in Warren County." This view was concurred in by Mrs. Emily P. Shaw, of Vicksburg, who considered the tree "a monument to our young manhood and we women and girls should stand behind men in a thing like this."

From the instances and the figures cited, it would seem that passion is aroused over mob murders, not because they are committed in defence of Southern womanhood, but because the entire relations of white and colored races are involved. In casual conversations in Mississippi Delta cities the following stimulants to mob murder were cited to me: 1. The nation-wide campaign for equal rights for Negroes. This is specifically referred to in the editorial of the *Vicksburg Weekly Herald* of May 16. 2. Induction of Negroes into the United States army, "putting them on an equality with white men." Cheap politicians, of whom Senator Vardaman is typical, refer to "French-women-ruined Negro soldiers," using every resource of this kind to foment race hatred, which is their chief stock in trade. 3. Survival of the fear of Negro domination inherited from carpet-bagger days. 4. The economic motive in all its variants, based upon the determination to deny the Negro his rights, to "keep the nigger in his place." 5. The sport in torture: Page 1 of the *Vicksburg Evening Post,* recounting the murder of Clay, had this passage: " 'Have you had enough fun, boys?' a leader asked. 'Yes, cut him down.' "

Unfortunately, racial animosity is exhibited not only in lynchings. Race riots are constantly threatened. Not one Negro to whom I spoke in the Delta region but wished to get away. Daily life for them is almost intolerable. Negroes are subject to every insult and abuse, not to mention Jim-Crowism, and they have had too much experience of the courts to rely on them. It is not surprising that they have purchased arms in a number of Southern cities with the intention of defending their lives and the lives of their families if conflict is provoked. A disastrous race riot was narrowly averted in Memphis, Tennessee, on the nights of Friday and Saturday, May 23 and 24. Says the *Commercial Appeal* of May 27: "There was a powder train all over Memphis Saturday. That there was no explosion was due to sheer luck. . . . Somehow we have drifted into a tense racial relation. It is nobody's fault and yet it is everyone's fault." Open threats of attack had been made by white men, to avenge the death of a street-car conductor. The mayor and city officials in conference were informed that the Negroes of Memphis had arms and ammunition, and proposed to use them in self-defence. Police and sheriff's deputies were posted, and what might have become a bloody race conflict was averted. With every lynching, the danger of such a conflict increases. Convince men that they have no stake in society and the courts, and no refuge in an enlightened public sentiment: insult, injure, and degrade them without redress and you create the desperation out of which springs violence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Carving of Russia

By LINCOLN COLCORD

Washington, June 7

THE sensation of the week in the capital—namely, the disclosure in the Senate that copies of the peace treaty are in the hands of financial interests in New York—has been at once amusing, discouraging, and alarming. What is the fire behind all this smoke? How does it happen that such a scandalous accusation can pass unchallenged—that it unquestionably is true? How did financial interests get advance copies of the treaty? Why should they be interested in it? How deeply are they involved in the negotiations in Paris? What are they planning to do with the world?

These are questions of the most profound significance, of the most far-reaching consequence. They touch the springs of that control of the modern world which until lately has been little understood by the masses of the people—the springs whence issue the forces that drive men to war and hitherto have driven men to peace, that rule the press and form men's opinions, that fill the world with magnificent opulence and terrible misery, that make a mockery of civilization and progress and human endeavor, that render it impossible for a day of science to govern itself scientifically, or for an age of freedom to be free. I shall attempt to answer these questions in my own way by telling a story as if it were a fact. The substance of the tale is a topic of common conversation in Washington, as well as in groups everywhere which have their ear close to the ground. And although I cannot base my statements on absolute proof, I submit that they conform to the development of events and to the tendencies of certain known factors, than which the candid reader will require no further verification. Finally, in order not to come forward wholly as a theorist, I should like to say that I have submitted the following analysis of the world situation, in precisely the bald form in which I present it below, to a man of great power and prominence, an American captain of industry, a student of international politics and industrial relations, who knows his Russia, and is closely affiliated with a firm of international bankers. I was shocked at the complacency with which this man received my suggestion.

"You've got it about right," he said, after regarding me calmly for a moment. "They're going to carve up Russia; she will have to pay the bills of the war."

"Do you think that the financial steam roller can iron out the situation?" I asked.

"Oh yes," he answered. "The present unrest in Europe will die down when the harvests begin to come in. I don't look for any serious trouble. I think they will be able to clamp the lid down some way."

At the beginning of the story, it is necessary to differentiate between the industrial and the financial bankers, the latter being the so-called international bankers. With the industrial bankers should be classed those groups which are primarily interested in industry, production, and trade; perhaps commercial bankers would be an even better term. The National City Bank, with its Standard Oil affiliations, with its interests in the American International Corporation and in the banking-engineering firm of Stone & Webster, is an excellent illustration. The financial or international bankers, on the other hand, comprise those groups which are interested primarily in operations of financing *per se*—in the issuing of bonds for vast projects, in the floating of foreign loans, and especially in the handling of the securities and obligations of Governments. The firm of J. P. Morgan & Co., which has acted as fiscal agent for the British Government throughout the war, and which has been a most important factor in the war financing of Europe, is an excellent example of this class.

In a philosophic sense the two classes stand today fundamentally at variance, and the case may be so demonstrated. The commercial groups are interested primarily in production; the international groups, in exploitation. The commercial groups have more connections with the industrial and trade world, think more of the problem of labor, and live closer to the ground. The international groups have more connections with Governments, think more of manipulating the works of men to the ends of arbitrary authority, and live in an atmosphere of power and bureaucracy. In general, the commercial groups understand that both trade and industry are broken, and that civilization cannot go on unless production is revived; they recognize that actual power lies in the hands of labor, and that there must be concessions and rectifications before the world goes to work again. The international groups view this situation more vaguely; they know the facts, but do not follow their implications; they still believe that governmental authority is supreme, and that troops will put down the revolutions and maintain the financial obligations. There is no better illustration of the difference than the contrast between the psychology of Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip, a representative of the commercial group, and the thought of my financial friend already mentioned, who didn't look for any serious trouble, and who felt that "they would be able to clamp the lid down some way."

This difference in the general function of the two main banking groups is beginning to result in a corresponding difference in policy toward the larger financial issues. In the nature of the case, the international bankers are close to the Governments; and the Governments are attempting to remake the world. What the Governments are proposing, the international bankers, thinking in terms of arbitrary authority, approve. But the commercial bankers, thinking in terms of production and trade, do not approve it. They sense its dangers. They feel that it is not founded on a sound knowledge of existing social and economic factors, but is almost wholly an affair of the bureaucracies, with the international bankers in control.

It should be obvious that the chief concern of the international bankers at present is the maintenance of a governmental régime throughout the world which will attempt to pay the bills of war. Early in the peace negotiations, they were not so confident as they have now become. They feared many things—most of all the unpractical idealism of Mr. Wilson; but his idealism has proved to be their greatest boon. I do not for a moment mean that Mr. Wilson sold out to the international bankers; I know him too well to make any such accusation. But he did insist on a League of Nations, without knowing what he meant, until he had said so much about it that his prestige was heavily involved;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and thereafter, as he met drive after drive of the imperialists, he sold out issue after issue for the sake of retaining his League of Nations. This the imperialists (who are the close friends of the international bankers) granted him willingly, foisting upon him meanwhile a rigid bureaucratic machinery for his League of Nations; in the cheerful knowledge that when they had effected an imperialistic peace, such a League of Nations, with Mr. Wilson himself committed to its sponsorship, would be the most powerful instrument imaginable for imposing their peace upon the world. Hereafter they could rule the world and no one would know of it. But, beyond this, they saw the immense political significance of the League of Nations. They saw that through the League (if through any device of bureaucracy) the political *status quo* could be maintained. Governments that would honor the nations' bonded indebtedness could be kept in power, revolutions of all breeds could be crushed, and the great onward march of the underworld could be broken up and thrown back into the regions where it belonged.

It was in this spirit that the imperialists and the international bankers extended their plans, here setting up a fictitious Government, there carving out a desirable section of territory, here making arrangements for trade concessions and privileges, there smothering some worthy but undesirable claim; refusing steadfastly to have dealings with Soviet Russia, and all the while revolving their great problem and preparing their great *coup*.

Their problem, briefly, was this: how, in spite of all, to pay the bills of the war. As things stood in England and France and Italy when the war ended, the Governments could not honor their obligations. The bonded indebtedness was incredible, inconceivable. We had produced and spent and thrown our all into the enterprise, only to roll up a stupendous bonded indebtedness for the whole amount; national wealth had been drawn from the people and placed in the hands of relatively few individuals; and the future must foot the bills by maintaining the obligations which those individuals held against the system and the Governments—against society. It stood to reason that, unless something marvellous were done about it, the peoples would not consent to labor through generations, or even through one generation, in order that, by honoring the nation's bonded indebtedness, they might enjoy the privilege of seeing a few individuals collect to the full measure on their securities. In fact, there were many signs that the revolt of the peoples against this situation was already at hand.

Equally well the international bankers knew that they could not collect the costs of the war from Germany. Germany was a broken nation, and she had to be still further broken; she could not pay and starve at the same time. But what then? The tremendous structure of war indebtedness could not be maintained for long under the old system, save by some vast new scheme of exploitation in undeveloped territory, save by adding another great charge to the constantly mounting overhead charges of society, save by a rich new inflation of the financial balloon. Thus a logical conclusion was reached: the carving of Russia must pay the bills of the war. It was no new thought; the policies of every Government, including our own, had been (perhaps unconsciously) directed to this end for the past two years. But now the ground had been prepared in public opinion, and the *coup* was ready to be launched.

This is the plan. The Kolchak Government in Siberia is to be recognized, in the certain knowledge that it will fall in due time. The fall of the Kolchak Government will be supposed to show conclusively to Allied and American public opinion the utter hopelessness of the political chaos in Russia, and the necessity for drastic action in that quarter. Thereupon the League of Nations will step in—and Russia will be carved. Siberia will be given under a mandatory to Japan. The Ukraine will be given under a mandatory to France. Great Britain will take the heart of Russia and the Baltic timber regions under a mandatory. Italy is not in the reckoning. America will be satisfied through a share in the exploitation of Siberia, through the participation of her bankers in the necessary financial transactions, and through the general stimulation of industry and trade that is expected to follow. Allied and American troops are to occupy Russia under the banner of the League of Nations, attend to the carving, and handle any manifestations of protest that may be made by the Russian people. Our trade representatives will flood Russia, there will be a career there for all our young engineering and administrative talent; and no difficulty is expected in convincing public opinion of the right point of view when the time comes.

What have we in the news of the day to support this fantastic tale? A great deal. We have, first of all, the impending recognition of Kolchak, the vast and expensive propaganda that has been carried on in his name, and the steadfast refusal of everyone in Paris to face the real political situation in Russia. We have the demands made upon Kolchak as contingent to his recognition, that he join the League of Nations, and that he recognize the independence of Finland and Poland, as well as the autonomy of Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Trans-Caspian region, and Caucasia. As for Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, these cover the Baltic regions where Great Britain already has supported Governments and is operating with her navy and army. As for the Trans-Caspian region and Caucasia, these refer to other fictitious Governments which Great Britain has arbitrarily set up to cover the rich trans-Caucasus oil fields. The recognition of the Mannerheim Government in Finland a month ago was another case in point. The policies followed with respect to Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and Rumania bear out the argument. Today we have the occupation of the Oesel Islands by Great Britain as the price of military assistance rendered to Esthonia against the Bolsheviki. We have, furthermore, the demand that the United States accept a mandatory over Constantinople and the Turkish Empire and Armenia; this would keep the Dardanelles open, and relieve the others of much dirty work. We have the great French holdings in the Donetz coal basin in the Ukraine. We have, above all, and proved by their constant policy to date, the disposition of our leaders to connive at such a plan if they think that they can carry it through.

Thus the international bankers stand in the background of the negotiations in Paris, arranging the destinies of men; while the commercial bankers, with wiser and more constructive policies toward the necessary banking arrangements of reconstruction, are temporarily kicking their heels outside. The plan of the international bankers would be a handsome solution of the war for democracy, of the war that was to end war for all time. I can guarantee that it will never be accomplished; but I am not so certain that it will not be tried. Perhaps we have been vouchsafed a glimpse of the method whereby the gods first make mad those whom they would destroy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bismarck

By CARL BECKER

BISMARCK achieved that kind and degree of success which won him the unqualified respect of his own age. He has been commonly regarded not only as the dominating personality of the last quarter of the nineteenth century, which he undoubtedly was, but also as a statesman of unrivalled wisdom and ability. There may have been, here and there, a timid protest against his methods; but the great fact which stared biographers and historians in the face was that this man, by the sheer force of his intelligence and will, had achieved for his country the supreme good—he had made of the discordant Germanies a single Germany, and had given them a consolidated and powerful national state. The ideal of nationalism was so pervasive a preconception of political and historical thinking that no one seriously questioned the services of a man who had made a nation. After the Battle of Königgrätz, Treitschke threw away his liberalism with the phrase: "A king who so quickly brought about so fine a stroke must be right against everybody." Such, in substance, has been the verdict of historians on Bismarck: the man who made Germany must have been right in spite of everything.

No doubt there was an uneasy feeling, even among historians, that much lay concealed within this "everything"; and the great war has thrown such a lurid and transforming light on the whole matter that one is now rather inclined to say that the man who made Germany must have somehow failed in spite of his success. In the light of the great war, at all events, the work of Bismarck is sure to be seen in a different perspective. What we may chiefly expect at present is a flood of books inspired by the rancors of the war—superficial books devoted mainly to denunciation. It is, therefore, fortunate indeed that we should have at the outset such an admirable study of Bismarck as Mr. Robertson has given us.* Mr. Robertson assures us that his book "is in no sense a product of the war. My study of, and interest in, Bismarck began many years before there was thought of war, and the conclusions and judgments expressed . . . were formed before August 4, 1914." The proof of this, if any were needed, is to be found in the thorough and exact scholarship which the book everywhere reveals. The author is not merely on speaking terms with the sources; he is on familiar and intimate terms with them, as the seven pages of discriminating bibliographical comment, as well as every chapter of text, make abundantly clear. One misses, in so full a list of material, Hofmann's "Fürst Bismarck, 1890-1898"; but the work is referred to in the text, and in any case Mr. Robertson has used the *Hamburger Nachrichten*, from which Hofmann obtained much of his material. The appendix in which Mr. Robertson deals with all the fragmentary evidence in respect to the secret treaties between Germany and Russia between 1881 and 1887 was prepared before the texts of these treaties were printed in the *American Historical Review*, of January, 1918; but it is an evidence of Mr. Robertson's excellent scholarship that the texts of the treaties, had he seen them, would have modified only in insignificant details the conclusions which had already been reached.

*Bismarck. By C. Grant Robertson. "Makers of the Nineteenth Century" Series. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

And yet the chief merit of Mr. Robertson's book is not its scholarship; nor is it that he has given us a vivid and faithful portrait of the man Bismarck, although he has done that; nor is it that he presents the life and work of Bismarck constructively and with admirable literary force and clarity, although he has done that also. The chief value of the book arises from the fact that Mr. Robertson has so far freed himself from nineteenth century nationalist preconceptions that he is not content to rest upon the achievement of national unity as the exclusive test of Bismarck's statesmanship; with the result that the reader is induced to ask this question: Were not the advantages of national unity to Germany largely destroyed by the methods which Bismarck employed to achieve and to maintain it? The end, if it be indeed good, may justify the means, if the means are indeed successful; but any fruitful interpretation of the work of Bismarck must concern itself, far more than has commonly been done, with the ends he set before him, whether they were good, and to what extent he in fact achieved them. It is the merit of Mr. Robertson's book that it places these questions in the foreground; and the author's genuinely critical and historical method of handling them throws much light on the quality of Bismarck's statesmanship, as well as on the vexed question of whether thoroughly good ends can be achieved by thoroughly bad means.

I

Bismarck often expressed his contempt for "theories." He was content to be a practical man, a frank and unblushing opportunist, ready to use any "principle" that might prove useful for the time being in attaining his objects. But his opportunism, Mr. Robertson says, was an opportunism of means, not of ends. "No man had a clearer conception of the ends he set himself to achieve; no man more deliberately on principle left the means to be determined by the conditions and possibilities, the realities and *imponderabilia*, of each situation as it arose." In one sense this is true. "My one ideal," Bismarck himself said, "is the unification of Germany under Prussian leadership; to that everything is accessory." If Aristotle had been present to inquire casually what "apparent good" he contemplated from the unification of Germany under Prussian leadership, Bismarck would doubtless have replied—"the welfare and happiness of the German people—*nicht wahr?*" Perhaps the reply would have sounded a bit perfunctory. One feels at all events that Bismarck had his mind chiefly fixed on the unification of Germany, and perhaps a little more precisely on "the leadership of Prussia," by which he meant essentially the *ascendancy* of Prussia; the welfare of the German people, it might be taken as a matter of course, was bound up with that.

To ask a Prussian minister to conceive of the welfare of Germany apart from the ascendancy of Prussia would perhaps be asking much. But Bismarck's professed "opportunism" was still further limited. Assuming that the unification of Germany under Prussia was to be taken as both means and end, it is still conceivable that a greater statesman, surveying with unclouded vision the history of Europe since 1789, and assessing at their true value the forces that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made and unmade the Revolution of 1848 in Germany, might have judged that the trend towards liberalism and democracy made up the "realities and *imponderabilia*" that needed most of all to be taken into account. If he had so judged, he might still have endeavored to unify Germany under Prussian leadership, but he would have endeavored to do so by means of the liberal principles of 1848 rather than by the very different principles of 1867. Bismarck had this choice, the choice of unifying Germany through liberalism, which was still so strong in Prussia and which was in harmony with the vital forces of the future in Europe, or through the dynastic traditions of Prussia, which were but late survivals of a bygone feudal age. He chose the latter. He chose the latter when, as Mr. Robertson assures us, he might have chosen the former: "There is not the slightest doubt that had Bismarck so chosen, the Constitution [of 1867] could have conferred on the new Confederation responsible parliamentary government. The responsibility for the rejection, and the consequences in the history of Germany that followed on its rejection, rests with Bismarck."

It is perhaps true that 1867 was rather late to make this choice; and had it been made earlier, the unification of Germany would doubtless not have been so soon or so brilliantly achieved. But in any case this was the crucial choice of Bismarck's career; and if we ask why this great "opportunist" rejected the forces of the future as means to his end and held fast to the Frederician traditions of the eighteenth century, the answer is, not that he was emancipated from all "theories," but precisely that he was quite blindly attached to a certain theory. This theory, briefly stated, was that the power, prosperity, and happiness of a people can best be attained by a Government, or state, whose right to act, in the last resort, is independent of the popular will. Such a conception of government must rest upon some theory of divine right, or else upon the theory that government is justified by the excellence of its results, or upon the theory that the fact of power is its own justification. Bismarck's philosophy of government partakes, with differing emphasis at different times, of all of these theories. His youthful excursion into rationalism made him unhappy, and after his "conversion" he fell back into a kind of mystical religiosity; so that to the last he would "open his Bible and find the confirmation of his faith in a Divine Providence and a God who ordered the world and chose the instruments of his inscrutable will." These instruments, it need scarcely be said, were not the Prussian people, but the Hohenzollerns, and the excellent ministers whom they in their inspired wisdom chose to advise them.

Bismarck's faith in the divine right of the Hohenzollerns to rule in Prussia was nevertheless combined with the very pragmatic notion that any government which was subject to the popular will would sooner or later cease to be a government at all. In his "Memoirs" he says that the Triple Alliance was "designed for the struggle which, as I feared, was before us; between the two European tendencies which Napoleon called Republican and Cossack, and which I . . . should designate as the system of order on a monarchical basis, and the Social Republic to the level of which the anti-monarchical development is wont to sink." Only a Government freed from popular control could hope to keep the path of "conservative progress." Therefore, while the king and the Government ought indeed always to be open to the advice and the criticism of parliament and press, they must never be bound by these influences. For this reason it was essential that there should always be at least one party in parliament which would support the Government through thick and thin; otherwise, the Government "cannot possibly rule constitutionally, but is compelled to manœuvre and plot against the Constitution." Finally, if the people would not accept the decision of the Government in crucial matters, then there was nothing for it but to go on without regard to the people; and in that case the king needed, above all, ministers who could not be duped by designing men, and who knew where to find the force to crush all who stood in the way of the necessary ends.

Bismarck's political philosophy thus reached back to the older faith in government as an instrument of divine origin, and forward to the newer faith in efficiency as the test of what is good, and force as the ultimate means of obtaining it; so that it is quite in keeping that we should find in this extraordinary man the reverence of Cromwell alternating with the cynicism of Frederick the Great. The "theory" which this great "opportunist" never emancipated himself from, the conception upon which his work rests and by which his statesmanship must be tested, was the profound conviction that civilization rests essentially upon force and fear—upon the obligation of the people to fear that force which God has given to his appointed instruments.

II

The "opportunism" of Bismarck was thus sufficiently limited by certain major prepossessions: the unification of Germany, as end, must be achieved by the ascendancy of Prussia, as means; the ascendancy of Prussia, as end, must be maintained by a modernized Hohenzollern autocracy, as means. Within the limits of these fixed ends and these fixed means he was indeed prepared to make use of the "realities and *imponderabilia* of each situation as it arose"; but the fixed conditions of the problem largely determined the kind of realities he could make use of, and greatly restricted the nature of the use he could make of them. "Ah, my dear fellow, you don't know that damned race as I do," was Frederick the Great's comment on the assertion that man is naturally good. Bismarck's political philosophy, as well as the nature of his problem as he had himself shaped it, required him to know that "damned race" much as Frederick knew it; and it was a consequence of his knowing it in that way that the realities and *imponderabilia* which he could best appreciate, and which he was constantly forced to fall back upon, were those which derive their force from the baser instincts of men—from their passions and cupidities, from their vanities, their follies, or their material interests.

The realities that spring chiefly from the more admirable qualities of men, the realities of a more impalpable but more abiding sort, Bismarck was less apt to appreciate. He recognized their existence indeed, and he was prepared to allow for them; but he had so formulated his ends that he could commonly make only a *disingenuous* use of them. Bismarck's central problem was shaped by the fact that he identified in his own mind and purpose two main objects—national unity and the maintenance of dynastic autocracy—one of which was in harmony with the trend of modern thought, and one of which was not. From first to last he accordingly found himself under the necessity of relying upon forces for the attainment of one of these objects which were hostile to the attainment of the other. The forces that were driving the modern world towards liberalism and democracy were indispensable for the achievement of German

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national unity; but when national unity was once achieved, these forces had to be resisted, broken, or destroyed, if possible, in order to consolidate and maintain the dynastic autocracy of the Hohenzollerns. The liberal aspirations of the German people could indeed be checked for a time, neutralized by the pride of national power, dulled by a sense of material well-being, even half destroyed by the poison of cynical precept and practice distilled by professors and politicians. But ultimately the political philosophy accepted by Bismarck, and enthroned by him in the Government of Germany, had no defence against the rising tide of popular resentment except sheer force.

The "acid test" of Bismarck's statesmanship is the fact that he never understood or knew how to deal with the outstanding political reality of his age—the trend toward democracy. He reckoned with this "imponderable," it is true; but he reckoned with it only as a man reckons with fire—as something which may be used temporarily, but which must be kept within bounds and be extinguished at last. In 1866, so Bismarck says in the "Memoirs," he threw into the frying-pan "the most powerful ingredient known at that time to liberty-mongers, namely, universal suffrage, so as to frighten off foreign ministers from trying to stick a finger into our national omelette." Mr. Robertson thinks this was not, at the time, his motive, that he was then rather of Lassalle's opinion that democracy would supply a needed check to middle-class liberalism. In either case, Bismarck "never doubted the possibility of giving to the royal power the strength necessary in order that our clock should be correctly set at home" when once the freedom to live as a great nation had been obtained.

Setting the clock correctly proved nevertheless a far more difficult business than he anticipated. When the time came he found himself confronted, not only by the National Liberal party, which he had called in for other purposes, but by a rapidly growing socialist party, nourished on the "powerful ingredient" of universal suffrage, and now resolutely prepared to destroy instead of to maintain the "royal power." Necessarily, unless the great opportunist was prepared to renounce one of his major objects, the purposes of these parties had to be defeated. To the "insanities of Social Democracy," Bismarck applied his two sovereign remedies —bribery and force; for ten years he used all the resources of the Government to outlaw and destroy the socialist organization, while endeavoring at the same time to wean the workingmen from socialist attachments by social legislation designed to make them dependent on the state. "Give the workingman the right to work as long as he is healthy, assure him care when he is sick, assure him maintenance when he is old. If you do that . . . then I believe the gentlemen of the Social-Democratic programme will sound their bird-calls in vain." At the end of ten years, the sum total result of drastic repression and "bastard socialism" was this: the voting strength of the Social-Democrats had increased from 312,000 to 1,427,300, and their representation in the Reichstag had increased from nine to thirty-five. The National Liberal party Bismarck did indeed break up; but this seeming victory was in reality a double defeat. Mr. Robertson describes this double defeat in a passage which goes to the heart of the matter: "When Bismarck broke the National Liberal party he left the Empire with no buffer between the Government and Social Democracy except an uneasy marriage of convenience between Conservatism . . . and the clerical Centre. The inheritor of the broken liberalism was the Social-Democratic party, and the growth of that party was a fresh proof that Bismarck had misconceived its strength, the sources from which it drew its recruits, and the methods by which it could be successfully combatted." Thus did Bismarck's "means" return at last to stand in the way of his "ends."

Bismarck's skill in effecting a temporary solution of an insoluble problem is not to be doubted. But the personal ascendancy which he won through the founding of the Empire, and the assured position which his diplomacy seemed to give to Germany in international affairs, obscured the fact that during his last years he was playing a losing game. Making the German nation, whatever may be said of the methods employed, was an act of constructive statesmanship; but imprisoning that nation within an obsolete political philosophy was a fatal measure. It may be said that Bismarck's positive achievements ended with the proclamation of the Empire. After 1871, or at latest 1878, his achievements were mainly negative. Henceforth he was on the defensive; and his failure begins from the moment of his highest success. Having tied himself to the dead past, he could no longer go out courageously to meet the future. Much is made of the fact that from 1871 Bismarck was a "man of peace." It was profoundly, even ominously, true; but the fact that he obtained peace abroad need not blind the critic to the fact that he failed to obtain peace at home. He demanded peace—yes, and more than peace; he demanded quiescence, submission, the renunciation of all the vital aspirations of the age that would not accommodate themselves to the Hohenzollern conception of the state as irresponsible power. This peace he never negotiated, and the end of his policy was disaster, not only to the Hohenzollerns whom he served, but to the German people whom he professed to serve.

There is evidence enough that Bismarck was not overconfident, in the last years, as to the outcome. His failure to exorcise the "insanities of Social Democracy" was as apparent to him as to others; but the failure seemingly taught him nothing except that in a situation in which force had failed the only remedy was more force. Mr. Robertson quotes from a speech in 1886 that significant passage which reveals the counsel of desperation to which Bismarck was driven by the deepening perplexities of the last decade of his ministry:

> We must aim at becoming stronger; we must show that we stand not on feet of clay, but of iron. We must find a means of becoming independent of the obstruction of the majority of the Reichstag. I do not advocate such a step, but if the Fatherland should be endangered I should not hesitate to propose to the Emperor the necessary measures. The minister who will not risk his head to save the Fatherland, *even against the will of the majority*, is a coward. I will not allow the achievements of our army to perish by internal discord, which I will find the means of counteracting.

Such words, by a great statesman of the late nineteenth century, at the end of a successful career, sound much like a confession of defeat. It was as much as to say that the work of his life was now imperilled because the people seemed unwilling to accept the kind of government he had provided for them. That was bound to be the case, in the long run; and the course which the minister hinted at was indeed the only course, ultimately, for preserving the Bismarckian ideal of government in the Germany which Bismarck had created—that, or a new war of "consolidation." The alternative was the legacy of Bismarck to William II.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Dream of England

By CHARLES WHARTON STORK

WILL it be still the old land,
The land we used to know,
Where hawthorne hedges blossom,
And trellised roses glow?

Will giant billows shatter
Their foaming bulks of green
Around the jagged Cornwall cliffs
And up the bays between?

Will Dartmoor still be sombre
In purples and in browns?
Will summer send an ecstasy
Along the Sussex downs?

Will tranquil Isis linger
On many a silvern reach,
By pensive spire and burly tower,
And copse of oak and beech?

Will Warwick wear a broidered smock,
Fine-stitched with white and gold?
Will Yorkshire moors roll Scotlandward
In fold on dusky fold?

Will England be that England,
Unblasted by the war,
With coast and heath and countryside
As lovely as before?

In the Driftway

THE passage of the Suffrage Constitutional Amendment recalls to the Drifter his first public address, made in his college days. The maiden speech was properly devoted to woman suffrage, at a time when to ally oneself with that unpopular cause was practically to declass oneself. The Drifter remembers well how his classmates looked askance at him the next day, with much the same horror with which people are today regarded who see something good in some of the theories of Lenine and Trotzky. The Drifter was asked why he would associate himself with short-haired women and long-haired men and whether he wished to ruin all his chances for the senior societies. He would have had a rough time of it but for one thing. His severely critical father, to whom he was bound by ties of the very deepest and purest affection possible in that relationship, was in the audience; when the address was over an arm went around the boy's shoulder and some things were said to him which made the college world seem well lost—then and now.

* * * * *

COMMENCEMENT season: thousands of sweet girl graduates, tossing aside their schoolbooks and turning relentless backs on protesting families, are rushing headlong on business. The Drifter whistles softly as he imagines this united assault on a business world already so highly feminized that a mere male like himself feels almost an intruder on lower Broadway at lunch time. But he does not share the deep dejection of his neighbor and her fellow clubmembers. Teaching now being classed with menial occupations, and social work an outworn hope, the daughters naturally choose something more progressive. This may even mean the gradual extinction of the Drifter's pet menace—the idle woman. It appears that a long-overworked Satan was laid off for repairs during the Red Cross epidemic, but now that the knitter, the patrioteer and the lady highwayman have gone by, he has resumed business at his old intelligence office. The Drifter's neighbor dreams o' nights of Bolshevism, at her club the mere sound of the name has driven out literature and the drama; history is, of course, bad form, and music a painfully debatable topic. Thus Bolshevism is at its old tricks of undermining civilization. The Drifter's neighbor stops playing with her rings and stamps a slender heel: "Bolshevism must be stopped—if it takes the entire time of every clubwoman to do it."

* * * * *

THE Drifter is happy to have seen recently the home letters of a young attaché of the American Peace Mission—one of the nine who sent their resignations to the President as a protest against his abandonment of the American cause. The treaty is, writes this youth, "a hideous travesty on the principles for which we went to war; a betrayal of every trust we put in the Government." In his resignation he wrote: "The honorable fulfilment of my oath as a United States officer alone would constrain me to a statement that conclusion of the proposed treaty will not, in my judgment, serve either the idealistic or the material interests of America, or, indeed, of humanity." There spoke the true American spirit. Moreover, it was a brave act, for the writer did not know what the outcome might be. But there was apparently no fight in Mr. Wilson; nothing at least has been allowed to leak out as to any action by him in regard to these men. As for this particular subordinate who takes his oath of office so seriously, the Drifter has still other reasons for believing that he will yet be heard from publicly, that he is of the fibre of which true American patriots are made.

* * * * *

THE man applying for a job did not attract the Drifter. His exterior was far from pleasant. But curiously enough the fellow showed distinct interest in a Holbein drawing which was hanging on the wall. At last he stopped short in the recital of his own virtues to ask pointblank: "A Holbein, eh?" The Drifter said, "Yes, it is a Holbein." Then he asked his visitor how he happened to recognize this great master of the pencil. "Well"—the answer came somewhat hesitatingly—"it is this way. You see, during the war I worked for the Secret Service and I was told to watch dangerous Germans. Now I don't know any German and I didn't know such an awful lot about Germans, either. I had to get some sort of a lead. So I used to go to the Metropolitan Museum every afternoon, and I used to wait in the room where the German pictures hang. Then when a fellow came around who seemed to like these pictures I knew something was wrong, and I used to follow him. On Saturdays and Sundays when the Philharmonic gave its concerts I was in the gallery, and I used to spot people who clapped too hard. I got many a fine lead from them, too." What great things the war has done for art!

THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

To Stop Lynching

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is heartening and inspiring to read "The Habit of Torture" by Professor Edward Raymond Turner, in the *Nation* for May 3. Something must be done to lift us above all the littleness, all the narrowness which sometimes sets us against our fellowmen. Professor Turner well says that this terrible thing will be seen lurking darkly in society, to come back to us "with all the frightfulness it had long ago in ages of the past."

Lynching is a problem for Negroes as a racial group, and the hour has come when Negroes must learn that their cause will be better served by directly reaching men of influence than by mere platform declamations among themselves. They must adopt new methods with a nation-wide organization, must have a definite programme and must agitate until those in authority know that the thing must be stopped. It can no longer be winked at. This racial group represents in this country the weaker people of a strong nation, and to them world-wide democracy must mean something—"Justice to the weak as well as the strong."

Washington, D. C., June 5 DANIEL W. CHASE

The Brass Tag

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: On a recent visit to Seattle I went to see the Equity Co-operative Printing Company—one of Seattle's many coöperative enterprises. The place was closed, although it was only half-past five. Two great screw-eyes and a formidable padlock made it secure. Hanging from the padlock was a brass tag with this inscription:

Property
Seattle Police Department
Central Station
4th and Yester

I went back the next morning. This time the doors were open and the shop was noisy with clicking linotype machines and humming presses. In the midst of this feverish activity sat a dozing policeman. What could this mean?

The explanation is an interesting sidelight on an after-effect of the strike. After the calling off of the general non-resistant strike this spring and the resumption of the reins of government by the authorities, the chief of police closed the Equity Coöperative Printing plant because he "got tired of what they were printing." Later, however, he allowed the shop to operate under the surveillance of a policeman. Each morning the policeman comes and unlocks the door. For six hours the machines click and whirr out their messages. For six hours the policeman sits idly in the midst of this activity. Each evening at closing time he locks the door with his great key and the machines and presses stay mute until the personification of law and order again appears on the scene.

Things do not always go smoothly. Some times the policeman does not approve of the matter being printed. A pamphlet printed in Russian was destroyed, without any attempt to see what it contained, merely because it was in the language of a distressed nation which our Government felt called upon to war against, and at another time volumes of the great classics were confiscated. Newspaper forms were broken up and destroyed and papers and manuscripts taken away.

A new turn has just been given the situation. The Seattle Central Labor Council has brought suit in the Superior Court to compel the chief of police to remove his uniformed incubus. The action is based on the feeling that it is subversive of good order for policemen to act as censor.

New York, June 2 JAMES P. WARBASSE

The Seizure of Colonies

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am amazed to find you in various articles, notably in that entitled "The Madness at Versailles" in the *Nation* of May 17, deploring the fact that Germany is required by the proposed treaty to renounce "all its over-seas possessions including not only its colonies but its rights and property in China."

I should have expected you to realize that what you call "its colonies" are parts of the earth's surface which belong to their inhabitants, whom the Germans overcame by force and have misgoverned with great brutality for the purpose of enriching Germans. Certainly in "a world safe for democracy" the Germans are rightly forced to give up this territory and the power which they have abused, and the termination of their rule should be hailed with delight by all who believe that the control of a people by foreign tyrants should not longer be tolerated.

We may not approve or entirely trust the scheme by which backward peoples are to be governed by mandatories, but its professed aim at least is government in the interest of the governed, while Germany never even pretended that she was aiming at any interest but her own.

Germany in surrendering the colonies which never were "hers" by any just title loses nothing and the new scheme is at least a step in the right direction.

As for Germany's rights in China, she had none, unless the robber owns the property which he takes from his victim. Her over-sea possessions are merely returned to their owners, even though held for them by so-called trustees. It may be well to terminate the trusts, but there is no room for sympathy with the robber because he is justly forced to relinquish his ill-gotten territory.

Boston, May 31 MOORFIELD STOREY

[Mr. Storey misunderstands our position. We have never objected to the renunciation of the German colonies, but to their renunciation *to the Allies*. We favor the thorough-going internationalization, not only of the German colonies, but of all colonies. We have repeatedly stated our belief that the Germans ought not to govern any colonies. Our position is Lincoln's: "No man is good enough to govern another man without that other man's consent."—Editor of the *Nation*.]

Foreign Interests in Mexico

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: We beg leave to ask you to print the following from *The Mexican Review* of April, 1919:

"A party of American and other correspondents and newspaper writers was entertained recently in this city by Governor Espinosa Mireles of the State of Coahuila, and Mr. R. V. Pesqueira, Financial Agent of the Mexican Government at El Paso. The object of the gathering was to remove certain erroneous impressions that have been inculcated regarding actual conditions in this country, as well as the purposes of the Government, especially concerning important legislation that is now pending. The fact was emphasized that there was no retroactive legislation to be feared, since it was prohibited by the constitution, and that foreign interests would be protected in every legitimate way."

The Mexican Review is published now in Mexico City as a semi-official organ of the Mexican Government. The above quotation is an assurance the Government gives to American publicists. Compliance with this assurance is all that the Petroleum Association expects or desires. Such consummation would satisfy the honorable investors in Mexico, and relieve the Mexican Government from such stigma as has attached to it from its apparent intention not to comply with its international obligations.

THE ASSOCIATION OF PRODUCERS OF PETROLEUM IN MEXICO

Washington, D. C., June 5

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Benefit of the Doubt

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I enclose my check for another year's subscription but somehow not as willingly as in the past. Indeed I have hesitated before deciding to continue. What is the matter? Is the trouble with you or with me? Perhaps I shall be better able to answer another year.

Johns Hopkins University, June 5 IRA REMSEN

Kolchak in the Siberian Press

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In view of the general ignorance among both Americans and Russians in the United States regarding the methods and character of the dictator Kolchak and his Government, this information from the latest Siberian newspapers to reach this country may prove of interest. In reading the extracts it should be kept in mind that no Socialist papers are allowed in Siberia. The newspapers quoted are devoid of even moderate liberalism.

Otechestvennuiya Viedomosti of March 26 reports: "Government officials are intruding upon the private life of citizens in the villages, the markets, and on the streets, using their whips. Their whip does not discriminate between the righteous and the guilty, and strikes anyone available—the village rowdy, the old man, the sedate peasant are alike abused."

Dalne-vostochnoye Obozrieniye of March 28 informs us that in order to demoralize the Bolshevist army numerous proclamations are being printed in Siberia and distributed widely at the front. In these proclamations nothing is said of the aims of Siberia, but, by an appeal to race hatred, the Red Guards are urged to desert from the ranks of the "Jids-Bolsheviki" (Jid is the abusive term for Jew) and join Kolchak's Russian army.

The following order No. 22 of Captain Kovalenko, of the city of Koustanai, is published by the same newspaper on April 9, without comment, since comments may lead to prison: "In view of the acuteness of the housing problem, it is necessary that all the Jewish population (about 35 families) should be evacuated and deported to locations thousands of miles from the railroads."

"The commander of Vladivostok, Col. Boudenko, suspended all the professional unions; they are all non-Bolshevist." (*Daliokaya Okraina*, February 21).

Otechestvennuiya Viedomosti, on March 26, published an official statement announcing the prohibition of the Siberian Conference of Teachers without explanation.

Daliokaya Okraina of February 2 reports: "The Bureau of Organizations of the City Coöperative Societies announces that the Minister of the Interior does not find it possible to permit the convocation of this conference, in view of the indefiniteness of the programme and the composition of the conference." The Vice-Director of the Department of the Police announces the prohibition in Irkutsk of the Conference of the Zemstvos.

These last two notices are of particular interest, considering the false information in the American press that Kolchak is coöperating with the Zemstvos, cities, and coöperative societies.

Dalne-vostochnoye Obozrieniye of February 27 reports that the archives of the Czar's secret gendarme service (*Okhranka*) were collected and transferred to Omsk, because these archives supply important information, with the names of men who are to be persecuted for working against Czarism before the Revolution. In these archives, begun under the Emperor Nicholas I, and called "The Third Department," all revolutionary leaders were registered. The material for the archives was collected by the famous *agents provocateurs*, everywhere, even abroad. In these lists are mentioned, not only Lenine and Trotzky, but all the Ministers of the Provisional Government of Kerensky, the leaders disliked by Nicholas II. The same men are now disliked by Kolchak.

New York, June 9 GREGORY ZILBOORG

Torture and "Civilization"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Apropos of Professor Turner's article, "The Habit of Torture" (in the *Nation* of May 3), Mr. J. O. Dorsey, of the Smithsonian Institution (see "Handbook of America" and other bulletins), maintained that tortures among the Indians east of the Rocky Mountains were infrequent.

Intimate living with these Indians, especially the Sioux, and hearing their stories, legends and history convinces me that Mr. Dorsey is correct. Wasu Luta, a well posted old man, never saw a torture, and he said his father, who was born about 1775, and lived to very old age, never saw a torture; he also said that when he was a boy six years old he saw the Teton Sioux women tie to a tree a Crow Indian captive woman, because she was supposed to be lewd (the Tetons were then ultra-virtuous), intending to burn her alive, and an old man, pitying her, sent an arrow through her heart. Sakan'ku Skonk, a Canadian Cree, who died aged 103 years, indicated conditions among Crees and far Northwest Chippewas similar to those among the Teton Sioux. All the old people I have met among the Indians give the same testimony.

And yet the written stories of these times are full of tortures among these very peoples, where I am confident they never existed. The public's demand for torture in an Indian story seems to have led the story-writer to insert this element. I have read twenty-seven versions of the capture and torture of eleven persons by the Sioux, near what is now Bismarck, N. D., and there is no truth in the story. Arikaras, enemies of the Sioux and inclined to defame them, admitted to me and to Prof. O. G. Libby of the State University that the stories of the torture were untrue, that they saw the bodies, three days after the battle, and they had not been tortured or mutilated, but were laid out sacredly with feet toward the waters of the "Holy Missouri River."

Several searching questions suggest themselves:

1. If the actual, unfabled tortures of all races in all places and ages were evenly spread out, not bunched in books, how thick would they be?

2. Does the overcrowding of population tend to make people cynical while plenty of room unmonopolized by speculative holders tends to make people neighborly? First frontiermen, as I have seen them before the speculative holders came, needed not a Christ preaching: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor"; they naturally did love their neighbors.

3. How much truth is there in the stories of tortures by Germans in Belgium and France? With first-hand knowledge of all classes of Prussians, and the remembrance of many foot journeys among the common people, I am keenly aware of the overcynical attitude of Prussians, occasioned perhaps by overcrowded population, and overlordism, and I doubt not that there were tortures, but after all, does not the indiscriminate repeating of stories of tortures, actual and fabled, occasion the "habit of torture"?

4. Is it a fact, as Mr. Turner and others assume, that inclination to torture is a vestige from the primitive, or is it occasioned by a false social product called "civilization"? The Assyrians and others in the purview of Mr. Turner are far and away from the primitive. Is not this inclination to torture a rather distinct product of "civilization"? If it has its force from nearness to the primitive, we should expect the Negroes, not the white people, to do the lynching.

5. Is not physical torture, generally, akin to ruthless capitalistic pressure and torture, both being a weapon and means used by a *class*, diseased with the sense of its own superiority, for utilizing and terrorizing those who are feared because they are treated with injustice? Torture seems to me devoid of morality and devoid of immorality, and merely a method used by certain types of "civilization" for expedient self-protection.

Fort Yates, May 18 A. MCG. BEEDE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

Seven Artisans and an Artist

Bits of Background in One-Act Plays. By Emma Beatrice Brunner. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

The Gentleman Ranker and Other Plays. By Leon Gordon. Boston: The Four Seas Company.

The Broken Image. By Lawrence Langner. New York: Egmont Arens.

Patent Applied For. By Lawrence Langner. New York: Egmont Arens.

The Marsh Maiden and Other Plays. By Felix Gould. Boston: The Four Seas Company.

The Moon of the Carribees. By Eugene G. O'Neil. New York: Boni and Liveright.

Molière: A Romantic Play. By Philip Moeller. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Without the Walls. By Katrina Trask. New York: The Macmillan Company.

The Living Corpse. By Leo N. Tolstoi. New York: Nicholas L. Brown.

THE one-act play has this in common with the short story, that its baser examples depend for effectiveness upon the element of surprise, its nobler ones upon an awed or delighted sense of culmination. In the former the action springs suddenly out of an ingenious coil of circumstance; in the latter it is a crisis that grows out of an unobtrusively but richly indicated past. Writers of one-act plays who aspire to any stage but that of the Little Theatres are, of course, tempted to use the first of these two methods. And, no doubt, both Miss Brunner and Mr. Gordon felt a thrill of satisfaction as they sprung their neatly set dramatic traps, each with its hard, sharp, little click. Since, moreover, they both indulge in the popular sport of baiting an impossible "Hun"—the gentleman, by the way, far more humanely than the lady—it is conceivable that the variety theatres will reward their efforts. Mr. Langner, who once on the stage of the Washington Square Players gave promise of an agile and intelligently ironic art, has here, we are sorry to say, sunk to share Mr. Gordon's technique and Miss Brunner's spirit.

Mr. Gould's tiny playlets are inoffensive in their remote mysticism of mood. They betray, in fact, a great innocence of mind. For they read, quite literally, like gentle but surprisingly apt parodies on the manner of Maeterlinck's earliest plays. Since they are seriously offered as original work they invite Dr. Johnson's comment on Ossian: "Sir, a man could write that kind of thing forever, if he would only abandon his mind to it."

Mr. O'Neil's work is on another plane. He has enlarged his art by adding to it the realistic portraiture of life at sea. The forecastle, with its physical confinement and its enforced contact between varied characters, has natural dramatic possibilities. These, as well as others that inhere in the sailor's narrow and monotonous life ashore, Mr. O'Neil has used to build up one-act plays that are vigorous without brutality and stirring without noise. His best gift is that of a hard and virile pathos. As soon as women intrude into his plots he loses restraint and verisimilitude and lapses, as in the fate and history of Smitty, almost to the level of melodrama. Among men he is in touch with reality; among women he is merely romantic. Hence his finest successes are "Bound East for Cardiff" and "The Long Voyage Home." In them the tragedy belongs to the things and the men in their real nature, and needed, as in all the noblest drama, to be but unfolded by the playwright's skill. Of this ideal Mr. O'Neil is evidently aware, but in the other pieces he approaches it only from afar. The final value of this volume will depend somewhat on Mr. O'Neil's development as a dramatic artist. But it places him definitely among the handful of American dramatists whose future is of genuine importance to our theatre.

It is not easy to appraise justly Mr. Moeller's "Molière" or to disengage its qualities. The reading of the play does not alter the impression made by its production. It confirms the opinion that the lack of inner life and warmth so obvious on the stage was not wholly the fault of the actors. The truth is that Mr. Moeller, who has scholarship, skill, and handsome ideals, is trying to write brilliant, artificial comedy out of a conventional and uncritical mood. It cannot be done. The problem is brought no nearer solution by withdrawing the scene into the past and studding the action with famous names. Molière's great moment in which he asserts the kingship of his genius against the temporal sovereignty of Louis is hopelessly anachronistic in spirit. Yet if it had been made truer in tone, it would only have shown up more baldly the artifice of the intrigue and the false eloquence of the dialogue. Thus Mr. Moeller's divided aim is everywhere apparent. He desires to write plays with enough romantic softness to please the crowd and enough brilliancy of execution to entice the critical. The former he may achieve; for the latter his equipment is moderate. His vein of wit and stylistic aptness is meagre and reluctant. He forces and torments it, but the surface glow he achieves is but that of rouge upon a pallid cheek. He symbolizes the cleavage between our drama and our stage. He is content neither to write worthy historical plays for the reader and, perhaps, the future, nor to concoct sentimental comedies for Broadway. The result is "Molière," which, after all, ran only seven weeks on the stage and added nothing to the kind of reputation which its author rightly esteems.

Mrs. Trask has all the fine aloofness from popular success which Mr. Moeller, probably, cannot afford. She frankly names "Without the Walls" "a reading play" and makes little concession to any possible representation. Yet for all her genuine elevation of temper, Mrs. Trask, by her imaginative dealing with life, is instinctively nearer the popular theatre than Mr. Moeller. For in this stately drama of the last days of Christ, there is not only a cruelly tyrannical father who imprisons his daughter in a dungeon, but the dungeon is opened by a miraculous coincidence and the rebellious maiden is united in life and faith with her noble and extremely wealthy lover. Transpose these happenings into a different key and age, and you have the staple of conventional melodrama. The characters in this action, also, are of that stark and unrelieved "goodness" and "badness" so dear to the public heart. The dialogue is archaic without exactness and the play's only notable quality is a luminousness of atmosphere that convinces the mind of the genuineness of the Oriental setting.

The best criticism on all these plays, except two or three of Mr. O'Neil's, is the very existence of Tolstoi's "The Living Corpse" ("Redemption"). It is a very badly made play in six acts and many scenes, and, according to the prophets of a standardized dramaturgy, should never have reached the stage. But it has held and moved great audiences in every civilized country. And it has done so through no nimbleness of wit or splendor of scene or suspension of interest, but only by virtue of that sovereign clarity through which its creator, at his best, viewed man and nature and human life. Read either Mr. Moeller's or Mrs. Trask's dialogue and then, despite the awkward translation, the simple question of Victor Karenin to his mother: "Do you mean to say we are all so infallible that we cannot deviate from our opinions when life is so complex?" Or consider, after the pseudo-heroic gestures of their costumed folk, the fate of Fédya Protasov, who was too fine to stay within the greed and dishonor of his social order, not strong enough to help change or break it, and who therefore drifted into a region of sensuous dreams. In the art of the drama, as in life, a hundred graces may allure us briefly. The enduring test is that of inner veracity, of the clearness and honor of the incorruptible mind.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Case of Alcohol

The Control of the Drink Trade. By Henry Carter. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company.

Alcohol: Its Action on the Human Organs. By the Advisory Committee to the (British) Central Control Board. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company.

State Purchase of the Liquor Trade. By Joseph Rowntree and Arthur Sherwell. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Why Prohibition? By Charles Stelze. New York: George H. Doran Company.

The Whole Truth About Alcohol. By George Elliot Flint. New York: The Macmillan Company.

THE case of alcohol, long in chancery, has been brought to trial by the exigencies of the war. The fundamental issue is how the trial shall be conducted and who shall be the jury. A foregone conclusion indicates unreasonable prejudice. The interests at stake are so momentous and the black charges against the defendant so unquestioned that the verdict of acquittal is ruled out. The *status quo ante* is as unacceptable here as in the political and industrial domain. But the same considerations apply to the problem of alcohol as to that of labor or of nationalities or of public utilities. It requires the same order of statesmanlike wisdom, expert insight, and judicious control to reach a solution. The intemperate temper toward alcohol that prevails in the United States is decidedly and unfortunately inimical to a fair trial or a wise decision. The acceptance of prohibition as the sole or the only available method of control is substantially the abandonment of a solution. The attitude that throws the suspicion of moral obliquity or self-interest or indulgence upon the defence of alcohol to any degree, from whatever angle, adds to the unfortunate atmosphere of prejudice under which the trial proceeds.

Under such circumstances it is peculiarly fortunate that the same trial is going on among a people nearest to us in language, tradition, custom, and that manner of translating reasons into actions which enters intimately into national psychology. The contrast is decided. The keynote of the British consideration of the case of alcohol is discrimination: not only a willingness but the sense of an obligation to study circumstances and regard differences. Overlooking distinctions is the easiest way to simplify administration; the American temperament, bent upon a quick efficiency, is prone to the habit; in the extreme it is brutal, as it is under all circumstances unjust. Stupidity, by its lack, overlooks distinctions, and puts all things superficially similar into the same box. Prejudice, by its preferences, wears blinders and ignores or belittles the circumstances that make cases. Mark Twain's homely illustration is in point: If a cat and a man sat down on a hot stove-lid, the man would forever after avoid hot stove-lids; but the cat would avoid *all* stove-lids. The question cannot be avoided whether prohibition is not nearer to feline than to human intelligence.

The English experience in official "Control of the Drink Trade" is recorded by Mr. Henry Carter of the Central Control Board, of which Lord D'Abernon is the chairman. It is a detailed and well ordered account of all the steps and considerations taken from the autumn of 1914 to the spring of 1917, to regulate the trade in alcoholic drinks; it reflects the practical quality that fixes attention upon results without overlooking the more delicate issues of method. The record justifies the subtitle, "A Contribution to National Efficiency." The determination to prevent alcohol from interfering with war activities was so unreserved that the Board would have resorted to prohibition had that measure been regarded as either the necessary or the best mode of bringing results. Though importuned by Total Abstinence Leagues, the Board decided against prohibition and directed its energies to measures of control. The success of the efforts is unquestioned. The policy proceeded cautiously step by step, striking at the most menacing spots vigorously and promptly, adjusting regulation to condition, and never losing touch with public sentiment, thus paving the way for a united stand against the evils of alcohol in times of peace.

The record of this policy of discriminating control loses much in reduction to bare summarized statement of what was done; the pros and cons contribute the flesh and blood of the skeleton. The restrictions limited the sale of alcoholic drinks, as a rule, to two periods, usually from twelve to two o'clock and from six to eight o'clock, and not exceeding five and a half hours in the day. Distilled liquors were subject to additional restrictions in hours of sale, in requiring special license, and in limited percentage of alcohol. "Treating," extra inducements, the sale of liquor on credit, the canvassing for sale of liquors, were made illegal. The Government established special regulations for selected districts affected by war work, acquired ownership of the places of sale of liquor in some instances and exercised supervision in others, removed all gaudy advertisements of drink, arranged canteens and social centres, and in general attacked the problem in all its phases by the methods of discerning restriction and control. They declined to introduce prohibition, sex discrimination in sale, rationing, heavier penalties for drunkenness; but they encouraged the use of light two per cent. beverages, and the sale of food on licensed premises. The increased sobriety, the advantageous effect on the output of work, the diminution of crime and social evils testify to the excellence of the results. The lesson of the experiment is to prove that the drink evil can be met by discriminating control adjusted to the various situations.

Central to the case of alcohol is the determination, in the spirit of impartial inquiry, of its actual effects upon the men who indulge moderately in its use and with due reference to all the circumstances under which the indulgence takes place. For this the Board appointed a commission composed for the most part of specialists of the highest scientific standing, with Lord D'Abernon as chairman, Sir George Newman as the medical officer of the Board, Professor Cushny pharmacologist, Mr. Greenwood medical statistician, Mr. McDougall psychologist, Dr. Mott pathologist, Professor Sherrington physiologist, Dr. Sullivan alienist. Their findings afford a convenient summary of the actual facts, free from all bias or desire to justify conclusions otherwise deemed desirable. "The temperate consumption of alcoholic liquors in accordance with these rules of practice may be considered to be physiologically harmless in the case of the large majority of normal adults; and this conclusion, it may be added, is fully borne out by the massive experience of mankind in wine-drinking and beer-drinking countries."

A specific solution for the future is proposed by Mr. Rowntree and Mr. Sherwell, joint authors of the most extensive investigation of the drink question in recent years. Basing their conclusion upon the results of State purchase in limited districts, at Carlisle on the largest scale, they give convincing evidence that the plan is feasible, and from a financial point of view yields the State a comparable revenue and ensures sobriety. The cause of the evils of the liquor trade is diagnosed quite simply—that it is run for private profit and becomes a powerful trade with vested interests seeking a quasi-political expression. It is gratifying to learn that the American type of evil exists overseas, though on a reduced scale, and there has yielded to the policy of complete control by the Government itself, which thus secures freedom of action. Such control carries with it the determination of the surroundings attending the sale of liquor. The atmosphere changes with the environment. The emphasis is placed upon the sale of food, and that is encouraged by granting the lessee seventy-five per cent. of the profit on food and a far smaller profit on drink. The moral argument is lightly dismissed in England. It would arouse the deepest indignation in this country. That the United States is now a partner in the drink trade by reason of the revenues derived, is clear. Prohibition aims to dissolve the partnership by dissolving the firm; the English remedy is to redeem the trade by buying out the undesirable partner. Those who de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spair of any equally rational solution for Brother Jonathan must regard his kinship with John Bull as a rhetorical affiliation, and equally despair that by any measure of reconstruction the American attitude will approach the British view.

The most conspicuous feature in the case of alcohol is the indiscriminate arraignment of the defendant as responsible for all the unassigned crimes of humanity. The substantiated charges are bad enough to warrant the black record which alone is held up by the prohibitionists. The contributory part which circumstances play in the case is too lightly considered; alcohol is sinned against as well as sinning. The charges relate to its effect upon the human organism, and, still more importantly, to the part it plays in the social life both of the indulgent classes and of the great body of laboring men. It is peculiarly to be regretted that half-truth physiology and crudely distorted and exaggerated accounts and interpretations of experiments have been given the widest publicity in the propaganda against alcohol. Despite the earnest protests of high-minded men of science, accounts have been retained in elementary school texts of physiology that violate grossly the standards of science and of pedagogy. It is natural that the virulence of this propagandist literature, of which Mr. Stelzle's book is but an additional example, should arouse a protest in the same vein. Mr. George Elliot Flint insists that the "Whole Truth About Alcohol" makes a very different story from the half-truth so fanatically sponsored. Many will regret that he has not used a more temperate form of rebuttal, without denying the occasion for the irritation. The veteran Dr. Jacobi introduces this "protest against the outrages of pessimistic prohibitionists. Its positive assertiveness compares favorably with the lying allegations of many of the partisan newspapers or magazines of the wrathful prohibitionists." The defence of alcohol consists largely in freeing the culprit from the mass of prejudiced and unscientific testimony that is accepted by the public jury, and making a fair statement of the uses of alcohol when not abused, and its relative innocence as the great pacifier of tension, the congenial compensation for the trials of men. The psychology of indulgence is a tremendous factor in human life, and cannot be denied. In considering whether the drink bill or the smoke bill or the moving-picture bill of a people, all on the supposition of wise regulation, is excessive or worth its cost, the issue cannot be decided in terms of thrift or of efficiency alone. We have no hope of eliminating crime or incompetence or poverty or bad habits; the issue remains in terms of the wisdom of practice to reduce the evils by vigorous and far-sighted control. Such is the solution attempted, and for war times secured, by the British programme. How it will work in times of peace is a question of great moment to the American public.

The economic and social problem of alcohol remains to many the crucial matter; and all discussion of the precise guilt of alcohol and the measure of its responsibility for disease and crime and misery seems academic. The great majority of persons who are not prohibitionists, and whose mode of life leaves a place for moderate indulgence of this order, who agree that the propaganda against alcohol is the incarnation of intemperance, yet feel it their duty to give the weight of their influence and their votes for prohibition rather than against it. They agree that the saloon must go; they urge that the case of alcohol in the United States is a record so dismal that extenuating circumstances are for the time irrelevant; they insist that as a practical mode of getting the case of alcohol on trial, national prohibition is the only remedy, the only way to cast the liquor interests out of the body politic. This point of view must receive the earnest consideration which the character of its upholders merits. Such persons may not realize the cost that will have to be paid for the end which they, along with all moderate users of alcohol, hold to be desirable, indeed absolutely indispensable to the sobriety of the nation. To obtain desirable results by undesirable methods always leaves a large bill somewhere; part of that bill is written in items of the fostering of unreason and injustice. That in this case it may contain items of a disrespect for law and a widespread conflict between sincere public conviction and public practice, should not be forgotten. It may be that matters had come to such a pass that the only way out was to sacrifice much for securing more. That still leaves the adoption of prohibition not as a measure of rejoicing, but of penance and confession.

Controversial issues of this order test the quality of human rationality more critically than more intricate questions in the realms of scholarship or statesmanship, and than questions in which policy may be more confidently derived from practice. The case of alcohol is not disposed of even by a Constitutional Amendment. There remains the wisdom of the provisions for its enforcement. The great desideratum is to get the case before a jury of the sort of statesmanlike temper that characterizes the work of our English cousins. A modest step to that end is to spread the attitude of tolerance, ready to ascribe to opponents of prohibition the same high-minded motives, the same larger outlook and experienced concern, as the true believers in temperance are anxious to recognize in *their* opponents. Their regret is that they have had so little occasion to exercise the consideration.

A Magnificent Gamble

The Dardanelles Campaign. By Henry W. Nevinson. London: Nisbet and Company. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

AMONG the humane, the unthinking, and the self-indulgent there is a tendency to regard the war as a closed book. Everywhere there is a strong desire to put the four years' nightmare out of mind and out of sight, as speedily as possible, and to lapse again into the comfortable delusion that peace is the normal condition of mankind. A universal course of reading in war books might be the part of wisdom, not to set up the brute god Moloch once more in his ancient shrine, but to sicken the world forever of the cult of blood.

To effect this desirable end, no better work could be prescribed than Mr. H. W. Nevinson's admirable study of the Dardanelles campaign. His qualifications for his task are many. For twenty years he has been a war correspondent. In other words, he has been an eye-witness and recorder of reality, the stark reality of death, in every quarter of the globe. A practiced observer, he began with the inestimable advantage of a classical education. He is a graduate of Oxford, and Oxford is justified of her children. Restraint, clearness, zeal for the undoubted fact are the marks of his method and his style. While it is hardly possible to write a satisfactory history of any campaign or series of operations without the enemy's documents and point of view, Mr. Nevinson has constructed, with the materials at hand, the narrative of a colossal failure which later investigators may amplify and possibly correct in detail, but which they can hardly hope to displace.

The large outlines of the Dardanelles campaign are known to all the world. Early in 1915 the British Fleet attempted the impossible in trying to force, in the teeth of a fierce current, a narrow strait defended on both sides by heavy, well-served guns, and in the actual passage by mines and torpedoes. It failed in this task, with severe losses in ships and men. A month later, a strong military force supported by warships succeeded in effecting a landing on the Gallipoli peninsula from the Gulf of Saros. Against prepared positions near the water's edge, trenches, rifle-pits, and machine-gun emplacements, backed by batteries farther in the rear, and strengthened by wire entanglements extending into the sea, these desperate men prevailed. They gained a precarious foothold on a small parcel of ground which they held till the end of the year. In spite of the enemy's best efforts, and in spite of the more deadly inroads of disease, they could not be dislodged. An attempt late in the summer to carry the peninsula by means of fresh troops ended in failure. The general in command was recalled, and, after

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suffering from Arctic cold as well as tropical heat, the remaining troops were successfully withdrawn from untenable positions. The Gallipoli campaign is the story of a magnificent failure.

Why was it attempted? According to the evidence, the grandiose project originated in the fertile brain of Mr. Winston Churchill; and it looked full of promise. "If carried out, it would have implied, not merely victory, but peace. Success would at once have secured the defence of Egypt, but far more besides. It would have opened a high road, winter and summer, for the supply of munitions and equipment to Russia, and a high road for returning ships laden with the harvests of the Black Earth. It would have severed the German communication with the Middle East, and rendered our Mesopotamian campaign either unnecessary or far more speedily fortunate. On the political side it would have held Bulgaria steady in neutrality or brought her into our alliance. It might have saved Serbia, even without an effort at Salonika, and certainly it would have averted all the subsequent entanglements with Greece." These are a few of the advantages Mr. Nevinson sees in the project, and they can hardly be gainsaid. If it had succeeded, the war might have ended in 1916.

Why did it fail? The chief reason was the forgetting of a tried maxim of warfare—that ships by themselves cannot win victories on land; they can only cover and support landing operations of troops. Besides, ships fight at a disadvantage against forts. "Amphibious" operations of the navy and army conjointly offer the one hope of success. Even Mr. Churchill saw this. But there was a fatal delay in securing the coöperation of the land service with the sea service. At the critical moment Kitchener withheld the necessary men. In the spring of 1915 he could not spare them from the Western front. The Turks had time to make their positions impregnable. Mr. Nevinson lays the chief blame upon the British Government. It was absorbed in the problems nearest home, and regarded the Gallipoli operations as secondary in importance. Therefore it accorded those operations only secondary support.

One element of tragedy is often the interference of blind chance. Friar Lawrence's messenger is stopped by accident, and Romeo and Juliet die. On the morning of August 8, the British had reached the high ground overlooking the straits, the key of the position. Victory absolute and overwhelming was in sight; then, in the midst of the pursuing force, six or seven heavy shells burst with disastrous effect. The Turks rallied, and the British were forced to fall back. The black malignity of fate was never more apparent, for the shells came from British guns.

War cannot be waged without taking risks. The Gallipoli campaign was an enormous risk, a gigantic gamble, and it came within an ace of succeeding. If it *had* succeeded, it would have been acclaimed as a master-stroke of strategy. It will only be remembered as a tragic failure. The reader of the narrative is left marvelling at the vast total of human suffering and human fortitude which Mr. Nevinson describes with such consummate skill.

Dark Blue and Rose

The Arrow of Gold. By Joseph Conrad. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company.

Christopher and Columbus. By the Author of "Elizabeth and her German Garden." New York: Doubleday, Page and Company.

THOUGH to the fortunate reader "The Arrow of Gold" is Conrad at his best (perhaps because it is his latest), yet from the standpoint of current criticism it is hardly Conrad at all. There is no spectacular universe, no "wonderful description of the sea in all her magic moods"; no sympathy with sailormen, no psychology of sailormen, in fact almost no mention of sailormen; no tragedy, no remorse; no Marlow. Some might hesitate to think the view of life "ethically sound." And yet the book is by Conrad, in fact obviously by him; it is exactly like him, and could be by no one else. If not just what one would expect (for who can predict the work of such a one?), yet now that it has appeared unforeseen it is seen to be just right. Spectacular universe, sailormen, and all the rest, fade from the mind in the presence of Doña Rita and Monsieur George.

If criticism tries to catch up with fact at this exciting juncture, its first panting opinion is to the effect that here as elsewhere in Mr. Conrad's work we have confident Romance in spite of the temptations of the realistic manner. No glory of the commonplace here, in fact no commonplace at all; no careful exhibition of the sordid outcome of youthful passion or the depressing externals of older emotion; no Constances and no Sophias. Faithfulness and wisdom, if you like, but not in middle-class disguise. There is no calling of "Kamerad" before the advance of democratic dinginess and universal insensibility. This is a story of remarkable people picked out and not like others, two "who have nothing to do with the world as it is." Yet the surroundings, the atmosphere, are nothing very exciting; it is not that this group of Carlists in Marseilles in the seventies is exciting, it is even funny to see how Mr. Conrad neglects the exciting opportunities of gun-running on the Spanish coast, of conspiring with contrabandista in the gorges of the Pyrenees, and other such matters. Doña Rita and Monsieur George are, of course, among the supporters of that Don Carlos who kept up a sort of glamor from the pretensions of the Second Empire. But they might as well have been among the flotsam and jetsam of the South Seas, or the coming and going between sailors' lodging houses and ocean tramps. The possible romance of surrounding or circumstance is almost contemptuously rejected.

Mr. Conrad concentrates on the one great thing—the passion that unites these two. And when a writer can do that he can leave out all sorts of other things, or have them what he will. If he can do that he can leave out wonderful adventures and descriptions and psychology and all sorts of romantic circumstance—or realistic circumstance either, if it comes to that—for in comparison with the one great thing all such other things amount to little. It may not be the greatest thing in art, though under its influence one generally thinks it is. Greatest thing or not, it is rarely attained in literature—English literature at least. "Wuthering Heights" is the resource, in such cases, of the poor student of letters, but it does not much matter what other things one mentions; in the steady brilliancy (often unbearable to the purblind used to the softer illumination of current fiction) of the one we happen to be reading at the time, everything else burns with a rather tawny glow. It is a great achievement.

The most beautiful thing in Mr. Conrad's writing, heretofore, was the last part of "Victory," that last talk between Heyst and Lena. It is true that some think "Victory" is but poor stuff, written by Mr. Conrad in a melodramatic effort to be popular; and others are a little doubtful for other reasons, asking whether the relations of that really unpopular pair were moral. But however people may think on such matters, the last words of those two—the good, if harmless, seeking to banish themselves from a world not less vile than dangerous—were, up to the episode of Doña Rita and Monsieur George, Mr. Conrad's latest squeezings of the wine of wisdom which he had trodden out of the grapes of wrath or what not else that had got itself into his winepress. Life is a tragic, a foolish disillusion. One has high hopes (he showed us long ago), a day of ecstasy, and final years of exile. Man has sinned in being born, and life punishes the sin. For men, and women too, are mostly marionettes which dance, first one way and then another, at the command of they know not whom. Yet out of this miserable combination of charlatans and criminals there come at times (they really do come oftener than Mr. Conrad thinks) one and another who show us in glimpses how beautiful goodness is. Poor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

goodness! to be represented by such pale timorous persons as Axel and Lena, or for the matter of that by such unrepentant sinners as Doña Rita and Monsieur George. That is the most ironic touch of all. Yet even that last touch is not wanting here, and the reader submits gladly to this last straw.

"Christopher and Columbus" is the latest avatar of the May and June babies, now become the twins Anna Rose and Anna Felicitas. They, also, are two strangers in a cruel and commonplace world; quite as separate from the life around them as those others, they exist in an uncomprehended universe without acceding to its awfulness. Born in a region of love and laughter, they pass into our sphere, trailing clouds of sentiment and philosophy. The portion of our sphere known to them is most terrible, with its Uncle Arthurs and Mrs. Biltons, its stewardesses and its hotel clerks, not to mention its impossible Mrs. Twists and Mr. Clouston-Sacks—terribly tedious too. But however awful, one or another twin is always able to open her mouth with some impossible logicality, and one is reconciled to all the forms of imbecility that their gifted creator sees fit to imagine. These semi-German twins of seventeen go (in war time) to England, where their poor uncle and aunt can't stand them; they are shipped off to America alone (of course meeting a nice young American millionaire on the way); they do not pause until they touch the western coast, where they create a most charming tea-garden; and so on. It would seem impossible that even Elizabeth (for short) could make one stand it; and yet she can. One is sure that such charming rose-color will not wash (to speak very coarsely), and yet in all probability it will, and we shall always find it fresh and new.

Such a book is frankly an extravaganza. The conditions are, each in itself, not impossible—no one can say that they are entirely unlike life. But taken together they make a combination a million miles away from the facts that we know. Yet in all this impossible circumstance there is opportunity for things which are not only possible but probable, in fact entirely true. All literature and all art are something like that: there has to be some convention, even though it seem the slightest; and once given a convention, whatever it is, it is a matter of degree only whether there be much or little. Except for technical reasons, one hardly notices that "The Arrow of Gold" is cast in a very conventional form—that of an episode in the story of one's life written out in after years.

Granted the form, then, "Christopher and Columbus" has more of its author's particular quality than anything else she has written. It never fails; whether in the half-whimsical, half-satiric comment of the narrator, the almost Orphic utterances of Anna Felicitas, the stately "philosophy" of Anna Rose, not to speak of the American shrewdness of Mrs. Twist—there is always the same free, rational, humorous view of life unlimited by convention, undepressed by constant inconvenience, so little tied down by current necessities that it even gives one something of the same lightness of spirit that one gets from the intense realization of Mr. Conrad. "Literature of escape"—so romance is sometimes called; but one does not escape (from the facts of life) by simply shutting one's eyes and thinking of nightingales or faery lands forlorn, or of the Newgate Calendar, or of mediæval tapestry. If there be escape, it is escape from the wheel of life by comprehending the evil of the evil, and yet liking the goodness of the good.

One would not impute high moral purpose to Elizabeth; her morality lies in her vitality. If we share her vitality we have for the time whatever morality there is. She here looks at the lumbering, stupid, hardhearted world as from a roseate cloud; for that is the way she likes best to look at it. But she has no notion that the world either could be or should be all love and laughter, or (probably) that love and laughter are enough to let one wind a happy way through the jostling labyrinth. But love and laughter are good things for all that—almost as good as the passion that is simply conscious of nothing but its own intensity, or the irony that sees clearly and refuses to be comforted.

Books in Brief

ALTHOUGH John Burroughs's latest book, "Field and Study" (Houghton Mifflin), contains essays that report very readably the results of his detective study of nature—the little whys and wherefores that penetrate so far and no farther—most of the essays are the product of brooding over nature in the large and man's place in it. This shift of emphasis from the poetic objectivity of "Wake-Robin" (1871) to the naturalistic philosophy of its eighteenth successor, follows the normal evolution of a life, but is, in the case of Mr. Burroughs, regrettable—he is so much better as a descriptive detective than as a philosopher. We must prefer the black-poll warbler of the present volume, with "his fine strain, like that of some ticking insect," and the white-throat's "sweet, quavering ribbon of song"—we must prefer such accurate and telling description to the author's rambling, repetitious, intellectually undistinguished meditations on religion, science, evolution, nature, and natural history. "When I write about Nature and make much of her beauties and wonders, I am writing about God." Properly interpreted, that is true; but the next sentence reads: "The Nature-lover is the God-lover," and that is rarely true. Two other passages, taken together, show precisely where Mr. Burroughs actually stands. On page 306: "One thing is certain, a certainty that we are constantly forgetting or overlooking, namely, that man is a part of nature, of the sum total of things, and that whatever we affirm or deny of the universe, we affirm or deny of him." (How can Mr. Burroughs say that the Age of Biology forgets this?) On page 245 is the other passage: he states that, with Wordsworth, he is

> well pleased to recognize
> In Nature and the language of the sense,
> The anchor of my purest thoughts, the nurse
> The guide, the guardian of my heart, and soul
> Of all my moral being.

Man, then, to Mr. Burroughs, is a part of nature, and nothing more. "Can we make two or three out of the one?" Why not? Jesus did so, Plato and Aristotle did so, Dante did so, Shakespeare and Milton did so, Emerson (Mr. Burroughs's first master) did so. Their ground for such a division, the very nature of consciousness itself, has not been disturbed in the least by the Darwinian hypothesis. In Germany the biological view of life, as Mr. Burroughs observes, attained an incomparable vigor, her material efficiency, her "power to rule the world of material forces," surpassing that of all the rest of the modern nations. Strange to say, Mr. Burroughs feared a Germanized world, dreaded the loss of "the spirit of freedom, of justice, of ideal values" (that is, the humanistic, the unnatural values)—"our blended inheritance from Greece and Judea and the meditative Orient." There is no evidence anywhere else in the book, or in Mr. Burroughs's other later books, of a real concern for our blended inheritance from Greece, Judea, and the Orient.

A VIVID account of a pedestrian tour in Palestine, by the first American pilgrim to walk the "Via Dei" of the Crusaders after General Allenby's recovery of the Holy Land, is given in Dr. John Finley's "A Pilgrim in Palestine" (Scribners). By way of apology for this somewhat casual and unpremeditated book, Dr. Finley quotes the letter of a British "Tommy" to his wife: "When I comes home again and please God that will be soon now Dearie, the Pastor can't say nothin' to me Dearie about the Holy Land, but I'll have sommat to say to he. He only knows it from books and such like Dearie, an' showed it on lantern slides—while all these days I'm walking in holy places, an' knows 'em like Dearie, fightin' for 'em, which you would be surprised to know where I'm writin' Dearie. Ay! I'll have sommat to say to Pastor." Hoping that his pages will have something in them for "Pastor," Dr. Finley writes from the point of view of an enthusiastic Bible student. While the Israelites were forty years in covering the distance from Egypt to Palestine, Dr. Finley "found a swifter way than any Cru-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sader ever dreamed of," making the trip in two and one-half hours by aeroplane. As Red Cross Commissioner for Palestine, Dr. Finley had frequent opportunities of meeting General Allenby. "When I saw him," he tells us, "I did not think of this man of powerful shoulders, of high forehead, of the kindliest of eyes, of blunt, staccato speech and of most genial manner, as a soldier. I was in the presence of a great human being. . . . If it were not known that every movement of his campaign of deliverance was planned down to the last meticulous detail, what he has accomplished would seem a miracle, something of supernatural achievement . . . no living soldier of any nation has surpassed the Battle of Armageddon." This was the man who entered Jerusalem "on foot, and without a single victorious flag, behind an aide," a striking contrast to the pompous entry of the Kaiser in 1898. There is a reminder of the visit of the German Emperor, on the Mount of Olives, in the "outwardly abhorrent and inwardly blasphemous German building in which the ex-Kaiser is represented in the ceiling of the chapel in a companion panel with the Deity, in which the Psalmist is painted with the moustache of a German General and the Kaiser is moulded in a figure of bronze as a Crusader." The author suggests that the little land, now delivered from the rule of the Turk, should be kept as an "internationalized" reservation. One cannot help wishing that this casual narrative of an intelligent traveller contained less of religious rhapsody, mediocre verse, and irrelevant meditation, and more of facts concerning great historical events. For the omissions, however, the censor and the military are doubtless largely responsible.

A SOUND piece of historical investigation, of a kind little appreciated by the public at large, has been completed by Professor Beverley W. Bond, jr., in his volume entitled "The Quit-Rent System in the American Colonies" (Yale University Press). The subject is not alluring, and the style, though good, is not particularly attractive, so that the work is likely to find readers chiefly among members of the historical and legal professions. Nevertheless, it is an important essay, treating of a topic that is of wider significance than its title would seem to indicate, and correcting an often misunderstood point regarding the tenure of land during our colonial period. Not many years ago a well-informed college president stated in a public address that perhaps the most significant and characteristic feature of early American life was the absolute ownership of the soil which the colonists enjoyed, as contrasted with the feudal tenures of the Old World. Had he read Mr. Bond's book he would never have been guilty of so serious a blunder, for he would have learned that outside of New England—and even there in some instances—every acre of land in the American colonies was held by a lord, either the King himself or some landed proprietor or proprietors, to whom a grant had been made by the Crown, and that down to the Revolution the old feudal formula, *nulle terre sans seigneur*, found application here exactly as it found application in England at the same time. The quit-rent was the badge of an inferior ownership; and as long as it had to be paid, the colonist did not have full title to the lands he occupied and tilled. This is the feature of the colonial land law that Mr. Bond has studied, and he has not limited his field to the thirteen colonies, but includes within his survey Canada and the West Indies also. He has added a valuable chapter on the British system of control and the activities of the Auditor-General of the plantation revenues, who had the quit-rent in charge. To the historical student the importance of the quit-rent lies in the fact that the colonists disliked it and tried to get rid of it, an effort that undoubtedly played some part in increasing the discontent which brought on the Revolution. "The quit-rent in the domain of real property, like the royal prerogative in the field of government and the navigation acts in the field of commerce, was an obstacle to complete colonial independence, and a check upon the ability of a people to utilize its own resources for its own benefit and advantage," says Professor Andrews in the introduction.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Bassett, John S. The Lost Fruits of Waterloo. Macmillan. $2.
Bloomfield, Meyer. Management and Men. Century Co. $3.50.
Crosby, Oscar T. International War. Macmillan. $5.
Gallagher, Ruth A. Legal and Political Status of Women in Iowa. Historical Society of Iowa.
Garvin, J. L. The Economic Foundations of Peace. Macmillan. $3.25.
Haines, Henry S. Efficient Railway Operation. Macmillan. $4.
Hobson, S. G. Guild Principles in War and Peace. Macmillan. $1.
Lavell, Cecil F. Reconstruction and National Life. Macmillan. $1.60.
Mackinder, H. J. Democratic Ideals and Reality. Holt. $2.
Millard, Thomas F. Democracy and the Eastern Question. Century Co. $3.
Rivet, Charles. En Yougoslavie. Paris: Perrin & Co.
Rowntree, Joseph, and Sherwell, Arthur. State Purchase of the Liquor Trade. London: Allen & Unwin.
Stoddard, William L. The Shop Committee. Macmillan. $1.25.
Wines, Frederick H., and Lane, Winthrop D. Punishment and Reformation. Crowell. $2.50.
Woodruff, Clinton R., editor. A New Municipal Program. Appleton. $2.25.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Carroll, Robert S. The Soul in Suffering. Macmillan. $2.
Holmes, Edmond. The Secret of the Cross. Dutton. $1.50.
McDowall, Stewart A. Evolution and the Doctrine of the Trinity. Cambridge University Press.
Watson, Albert D. The Twentieth Plane. Philadelphia: Jacobs & Co. $2.

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

"A book by a critic who knows what he is talking about."—GEORGE M. COHAN.

THE POPULAR THEATRE

By GEORGE JEAN NATHAN

¶ The first book about the theatre *as it actually is* by "the best of all modern critics of the drama."
—*Gordon Craig.*

$1.60 at all bookshops

ALFRED A. KNOPF, 220 W. Forty-second St., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDUCATION

Barnes, Walter, editor. Types of Children's Literature. Yonkers: World Book Co.

Bartholomew, Wallace E. Bookkeeping Exercises, Parts 1 and 2. Gregg Publishing Co. 60 cents.

Bexell, J. A. First Lessons in Business. Lippincott. 68 cts.

Burke, Edmund. Speech on Conciliation with America. Chicago: Scott, Foresman.

Burton, Harry E., editor. Vergil's Æneid, The First Six Books. Silver, Burdett.

Downing, Elliot R. A Source Book of Biological Nature-Study. University of Chicago Press. $3.

Mérimée, Prosper. Colomba. Macmillan. 60 cents.

Kelsey, Rayner W. Centennial History of Moses Brown School, 1819-1919. Providence: Moses Brown School. $2.

Powell, Lyman P., and Curry, Charles M., editors. The World and Democracy. Rand, McNally.

Schweikert, Harry C., editor. Russian Short Stories. Scott, Foresman.

Texts for Students. New volumes: Selections from Matthew Paris; Selections from the Vulgate; The Epistle of St. Clement of Rome; Selections from Giraldus Gambrensis; Latin Writings of St. Patrick. London: Society for Christian Knowledge.

Thompson, John G., and Bigwood, Inez. Winning a Cause. Silver, Burdett.

By CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN

FIFTY YEARS OF EUROPE (1870 to 1919)

These fifty years are from the end of the Franco-Prussian War to the end of the World War; a period when the shadow of the former and the dread of the latter hovered over the minds of men. With maps, including several double-paged ones in color; 428 pages. $2.50 net.

TWO EARLIER BOOKS BY PROFESSOR HAZEN

Alsace-Lorraine Under German Rule

4th printing, $1.30 net.

"Terse, convincing and luminous."—*New York Tribune.*

"Presents just what the reader wants to know."—*Wisconsin Library Bulletin.*

Europe Since 1815

14th printing, $4 net.

"Has easily the field in English. For the last twenty-five years it is almost without a competitor."—*Harvard Graduates' Magazine.*

H. J. MACKINDER'S Democratic Ideals and Reality

This high English authority shows the bearing of commercial and industrial geography on possible future wars. $2.00 net.

New York Sun: "Fascinating . . . has more than present applicability. He sees the world whole."

Dr. T. BODLEY SCOTT'S The Road To a Healthy Old Age

New York Times' Review: "Most practical and helpful . . . most illuminating." $1.35 net.

Henry Holt and Company, 19 W. 44th St., New York

A CALL-TO-ACTION Conference

By Episcopal Churchmen

CHURCHMEN! All around us the world is in turmoil. Empires are crashing to ruin, and the established order is everywhere tottering.

Has the Episcopal Church no clear word of *inspiration, of faith, for the building of the New Order?* If the trumpet of God give forth an uncertain sound, who shall prepare him for the battle? In England, the Church Socialist League declares: "The Church as a whole is failing to maintain the ideals and standards it has so long proclaimed, and is aiming to achieve, not the salvation of society, but the mere 'stability of the existing order.'" Is this also true of us? Followers of the Carpenter should be always on the side of the workers in their struggle for "life and life more abundant." The Church Socialist League, mindful of this bounden duty, therefore issues hereby an invitation for a "Call to Action Conference," to which all churchmen in sympathy with Christ's challenge "Ye Cannot serve God and Mammon" are invited. This Conference will take place in the Club Room of the People's House, 7 East 15th Street, New York City, Friday, June 27th, at 10 A.M.

For details of the Conference address

Rev. Horace Fort,
Secretary Conference Committee, Church Socialist League,
604 Frederick Ave., Cantonsville, Md.

The NATION is a member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations which regularly audits and attests all figures given. **A. B. C.**

PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA

Monographs and separates in Sciences, Economics, History, Philology, Philosophy, etc.

List of titles and prices free on request.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
Berkeley, Cal. 280 Madison Ave., N. Y.

The Harper Columbia Books That Sing

THE BUBBLE BOOKS

By RALPH MAYHEW & BURGES JOHNSON
$1.00 Each
HARPER & BROTHERS
Established 1817.

WOMEN AND THE LABOUR PARTY

Indispensable to a comprehension of woman's place in the new social order. By the ten leading women of England. Introduction by Arthur Henderson.

(At good bookstores, 50c.)

Published by B. W. HUEBSCH *New York*

THE TURNOVER OF FACTORY LABOR

By SUMNER H. SLICHTER

The first book on the labor turnover which treats this important question from all angles. *Illus., 8vo, $3.00 net.*

THIS IS AN APPLETON BOOK

If we were permitted to subscribe to but one magazine, that magazine would be The Nation. The Nation has no rival at the present time.

But if you subscribe to more than one magazine you might be interested in

DR. ROBINSON'S
VOICE IN THE WILDERNESS

which, strangled one year and a half ago, has come to life again. It deals with the burning questions of the day in an individual, rather interesting manner.

Price two dollars per annum; single copy twenty cents.

Address: Voice in the Wilderness,
12 Mount Morris Park West,
New York City.

THE MILLENNIUM?

By
Sir IAN HAMILTON
Author of
"A Staff Officer's Scrap-Book"

Paper Covers

Crown 8vo. $1.00 *Net.*

"A very remarkable book."—*Daily News.*

"A racy tract."—*Nation* (London.).

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers
FOURTH AVE. AND 30TH ST., NEW YORK

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him and The Nation.

SUMNER'S COLLECTED ESSAYS

Four volumes by William Graham Sumner
Cloth, $10.00 per set. $2.50 per volume
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS
New Haven, Connecticut.
280 Madison Avenue, New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 14, 1919 No. 2815

The Independent Labor Party of Great Britain

By J. RAMSAY MACDONALD

THE Independent Labor party is for the moment the red rag to the bull of ordinary British opinion. For years it has been the subject of almost daily attack in the newspapers—especially the Northcliffe and Hulton journals—and the method pursued has been a repetition, almost unvaried in language, of certain cheap misrepresentations designed to rouse passionate prejudice. The party, however, neither decays nor dies, and an explanation of its position may not lack interest for readers of the *Nation*. It is a Socialist party, and must not be confused with the Labor party, with which, however, it is affiliated, and with which it acts for electoral purposes. Its Parliamentary candidates, for instance, are run in the general list of candidates for which the Labor party is responsible. Its socialism is not of the dogmatic type. It believes in the collective control of land and capital, but it interprets itself as a continuation of British liberal tradition, and connects its economic and industrial theories with the British trade union movement. Evolution is the breath of its life. When it was started a quarter of a century ago, chiefly by the efforts of the late Mr. Keir Hardie, it had a clear conception of a goal—socialism; and an equally clear conception of a method—the welding of the working class, especially the trade unionists, into a political party separate from the other parties.

After strenuous work—generally of the nature of attack upon old leaders like Mr. Ben Pickard, Mr. C. Fenwick, and Mr. H. Broadhurst—it swung the British trade unions around into politics, and formed the Labor party. When the war broke out it took up an attitude which exposed it to the wildest ravings of misrepresentation and calumny; its total destruction under the wrath of popular passion and the repressive action of the Government was confidently expected; at the recent election it lost its Parliamentary leaders; it is regarded by some sections of the Labor party as something of an ugly duckling of imperturbable persistence but of unpopular activity. Yet the party leaders have never forfeited their personal power within the councils of the working classes, or the confidence reposed in them, and in all conferences held throughout the war years, the curious spectacle was uniformly witnessed of the unpopular and maligned leaders receiving the most enthusiastic outpourings of welcome from delegates who proceeded later on to vote against them.

Meanwhile, the party itself, after the first rending turmoil of the outbreak of the war, began to right itself. Its public meetings were always crowded, and a campaign to smash them up was started by certain London newspapers. The situation was handled by the Independent Labor party leaders with a deft skill, and the propaganda of the party was continued through every channel that could be kept open. Twelve times was its printing business raided, but the results were always futile. The leaders were beset by *agents provocateurs*, but arrests were confined to the less known men, although police agents were present at all meetings. An official friend once joked with me about a slight error in an allusion I made in one of my speeches, and gave me to understand that verbatim reports were supplied to Whitehall to be carefully scrutinized.

The membership of the party steadily increased, its recruits coming mainly from the young educated democracy and from that class which is animated by political liberalism, and from those deeply sincere, religious minds which find their companionship in the Society of Friends. On its economic and militant side it has drawn to it the men and women—mostly young—who are influenced by the revolutionary thought which war engenders, and who find in the party those controlling and coördinating forces which relate revolution to progress, and give dramatic change an evolutionary method. On its political side, it has drawn from the Liberal party many of its devoted workers. The transferred allegiance of Mr. Ponsonby, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. R. C. Lambert, and within the last few days, Colonel Wedgwood, M. P., is only representative of transferences of less conspicuous, but in their own localities not less important, personages from John o' Groat's to Land's End.

I write while the chairman of the party is delivering his annual address to the delegates assembled in the Huddersfield Town Hall. In the great gathering of delegates, and in the crowded galleries, one feels the imperious surge of the spirit which possesses this party. One feels that its defiance is of the soul and not of the lip, and one understands how it is that this apparent handful of people has defied popular opinion, has influenced hearts when it does not seem to have influenced policy, and has increased its following all the time. The Huddersfield Conference is attended by 360 delegates, and the report presented to them records during the last year an increase of 11,000 members, 139 branches, and £430 in fees. There are now 783 branches of the party; £30,000 were raised for the recent general election, and of this nearly £3,000 remain unexpended ready for further fights, while another reserve fund, also amounting to nearly £3,000, is in existence; thirteen organizers are at work in the country. All these figures reach points never hitherto touched by the party, and set a much-needed example to other political parties to publish their financial resources.

The party's position on the war has always been misrepresented. It was "pro-German"; it consisted of "the agents of the Kaiser"; and what not. The truth was that it was simply democratic and international. Despite what is said to the contrary, it took with it the overwhelming majority of British Socialists. In Great Britain, as everywhere else, the windy, strutting sections of Socialists, who use strong language as a substitute for strong opinions, became chauvinist, and gave voice to the wildest passions and prejudices of the crowd, enjoying in consequence an immediate respectability to which they were unaccustomed, but which they found delectable. Almost with that sole excep-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, the British Socialists followed the Independent Labor party.

The I. L. P.—as the party is commonly called—took the political view of war. War was the breakdown of the rickety machine of diplomacy, the natural and inevitable consequence of policy; fighting had to be conducted by political as well as by military weapons, by public opinion as well as by shot and shell. For instance, when the Russian Revolution came, the Independent Labor party, in Parliament and out, begged the Government to regard it as an opportunity by which to get at the German democracy rather than as one to reconstitute a Russian offensive; victory was to be the freeing of democracy, not the destruction of any people, and certainly not the partitioning of Europe for purposes of revenge, imperialism, or militarism. I admit that this was an angle of vision most annoying to a public which had been seized by the ordinary old passions of war. It seemed to be treason, because it represented war and its problems in a relationship which the man in the street and his newspaper could not understand. But, whatever the immediate incidents which caused the outbreak of the war, and whatever the emotions which stirred the people when going into it, the party believed that it saw the Government entering another great conflict through which it was to go in precisely the same way that Governments had gone through wars before. In every political writer who had lived through such times, from Aristophanes to Bolingbroke and Cobden, it read of the dangers, the mistakes, and the disappointments which were ahead. When, in course of the years, it was seen how the war was commandeering every resource of the nations, the party pointed out—and therefore gave more offence—that a purely military end would come, if it came at all, only after revolution had been made inevitable, only after the very foundations of society had been displaced.

I doubt if ever there was such a series of political predictions fulfilled with such completeness. But the party was not merely critical. At every stage it proposed a policy, based always upon the fundamental assumption that the peoples concerned had to understand one another, and that, in consequence, some international meeting like the Stockholm one should be held. To win the war for democracy and to secure for democracy that power which would end the conditions from which the war sprang—that, in a sentence, was the policy of the Independent Labor party and the key to all that it said and did during the war and the armistice period. That may be a position intellectually and emotionally too detached for the crowds in the nations at war to appreciate. Cobden may have been right in saying that when cannons speak everything else must speak in the same way, or keep silence. Week after week, Lord Morley impressed upon me the doctrine of "iron silence." Be that as it may, there always will be during every war some patriots who will keep their minds clear of the battle smoke, and view war in its political completeness—and I suppose, so long as wars are fought, the consequences to them will be what they have been to us. In any event, England will always be grateful that Cobden discovered the wisdom of silence only after he had committed the folly of speech.

The internal politics of the party suffer from the revolutionary sentiments of the time. The recent election has dealt a stunning blow to parliamentarianism in Great Britain. The appeal was so false, and the result so disproportionate to the voting, that confidence in representative democracy has been shaken; and the admission is general that the personnel of the Parliament is sadly deteriorated. Quite aside from this, the party would have experienced trouble with a Left wing. When the jazz music of revolution is playing all over Europe, there are feet here that must trip to it, even if the dance is not native to us.

The industrial strike for political purposes is a very old idea. It was revived by the modern movement of syndicalism in France; it was encouraged by the failure of the Labor party after 1906 to effect dramatic changes in politics; since the war, the strike and the threat to strike have won enormous advantages for labor, even when the trade-union officials were opposed to any action being taken. Industrial, or "direct," action has therefore come to the centre of the stage of British labor politics.

Moreover, two movements have given it a new authority. The National Trade Guilds have been battering at Parliament as the representatives of industrial democracy, and at the state as the absolute authority in a nation. They argued that the workers as workers had to create something like an industrial legislature with authority over industrial affairs, because geographical areas, called constituencies, full of a medley of electors removed in mind and in interests from the problems of the workshop, could never create a body of representatives whose industrial mind would be sufficiently definite to make it a satisfactory authority to deal with the real life of the people.

Then came the Russian Soviets, and the rule of the workers secured by the disfranchisement of all those who did not work. To industrial democrats here, this method of government causes less shock than might be imagined. For up to the present time our House of Commons has been elected by a franchise which deprived millions of workmen of the right to vote, and our House of Lords is the purest example of a Soviet which the world has ever seen—a Soviet, however, not of the workers, but of the aristocracy.

The Independent Labor party is therefore peculiarly exposed to the movements for the political strike and for the reconstruction of our Constitution on Soviet models. These movements, however, do not really go deep. The party may occasionally relieve its feelings by passing pious resolutions of challenge and defiance; in practical action it will continue to follow its leaders, none of whom are bitten by these projects, all of whom believe in parliamentary democracy.

Still, the party will undoubtedly respond to industrial movements. This country today is spending enormous sums of money to keep its people quiet and to try to tide over the transition period between war and peace; tomorrow it will have to pay its debts. Today, promises may be made to pay high wages; tomorrow, means will have to be found for providing them. Yesterday, we were told that there was unemployment because there was overproduction; today, we are told that more production will prevent unemployment; tomorrow, we shall have to face the problem. All this is to mean industrial unsettlement. Under such conditions, the sagacity of the party will be taxed to the utmost, and its allegiance to parliamentary methods will be tested under a terrible strain. I believe it will emerge successfully from its ordeal; for our intelligent young workmen are coming into its ranks, and its older leaders have given it a spirit and a tradition. In any event, the party is steadily returning to its old commanding place in the labor movement, and the storm-tossed adventures through which it passed during the war will only add to the respect in which it is held and the authority which it is to wield.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Constitutionalism in Japan

By ERNEST WILSON CLEMENT

IT was on February 11, 1889, that the Constitution of Japan was promulgated by the late Emperor, now known as Meiji Tenno. It was not until July 4, 1890, that the first election for members of a National Assembly was held; and it was not until November 29, 1890, that the first session of the Japanese National Assembly was formally opened. Although technically, according to the Preamble of the Constitution, the time of the opening of that session was to be "the date when the present Constitution comes into force," yet the Constitution was practically in force as soon as it was promulgated, because preparations had to be commenced to carry out in detail its provisions and the provisions of the various laws accompanying it. In any event, the date when Japan was formally declared by its Sovereign a country to be governed constitutionally is a red-letter date in Japanese history. And the thirtieth anniversary of that event was duly celebrated in Japan on February 11, 1919. It is, therefore, interesting to consider briefly the progress and present status of constitutionalism in Japan.

In the first place, the Emperor is still nominally and theoretically the supreme authority, "combining in himself the rights of sovereignty," but "exercising them according to the provisions of the present Constitution." In practice, his authority is limited, because he has delegated certain powers of administration to others. He reigns, but he does not rule; he does not interfere in the actual administration of affairs of state; he does not exercise "personal rule." It may, therefore be said, rather paradoxically, that the Emperor of Japan is at the same time an "absolute monarch" and an absolute figure-head.

In the second place, there is a Privy Council, which is "the highest body of the Emperor's constitutional advisers." The Ordinance by which it is constituted specifies six "matters" concerning which it "shall state its opinions." But, as the sixth clause includes "matters specially called for," there is no real limit to its purview of matters of state. "It is higher than the Cabinet, because its advice may be asked concerning the organization of a Cabinet." But, "though the Privy Council is the Emperor's highest resort of council, it shall not interfere with the Executive" (Art. VIII of the Ordinance).

In the third place, the Genro, or "Elder Statesmen," form an extra-constitutional body, which, however, outranks every constitutional body, except the Emperor and the Privy Council. There are now only three survivors (Yamagata, Matsukata, and Oyama) of the original body. But Saionji has been added to their number; and Okuma is sometimes informally included. They have made, and unmade, Cabinets; they have been the power behind and before the throne. While their influence can be wholly eliminated only by death, yet their authority is on the wane. It is an open secret that, when Terauchi went out, they endeavored to persuade Saionji to form a somewhat transcendent Cabinet as in former days. But, when he declined to be a catspaw, they were forced to consent to a party Cabinet under Hara.

Fourthly, the Cabinet also, as a body, is not recognized in the Constitution. "Ministers of State" are mentioned as individuals and to that extent recognized separately in their official capacities; but the Cabinet as a body has no official standing. It is only indirectly recognized as a constitutional organ; it must, however, be taken into consideration as a body which rarely, if ever, fails to act conjointly. Of the sixteen Cabinets whose term of office fell entirely within the period of thirty years under consideration, the average duration of the first eight Ministries, covering eleven and one-half years, was a little over seventeen months; while the average duration of the last eight Ministries, which covered seventeen years, has been twenty-six months. Those figures indicate lessening disturbances and greater steadiness, which are still more evident in connection with the Imperial Diet.

It is also interesting to note that, during the first period, with the exception of only six months, three Elder Statesmen (Yamagata, Matsukata, and Ito), took turns as Premier; and in the second period, Katsura and Terauchi (followers of Yamagata) and Saionji (Ito's successor) almost monopolized the office of Premier, in which Katsura and Saionji alternated for twelve years.

While not one of the Cabinets could be called an absolutely pure party Cabinet, though several were practically dominated by party influence, it should be observed that the present Hara Cabinet, which began its official career within the period of thirty years under consideration, is as completely a party Cabinet as is possible under present conditions. According to the regulations now in force, the Ministers of War and Navy must be officers in the active service of the army or the navy and are debarred from membership in a party. The Foreign Minister also is not nominally a member of any party, but he is known to be in sympathy with the Seiyukai, of which party, the present majority in the Lower House, all the other holders of portfolios are active members.

Fifthly, the Japanese National Assembly is not like either the American Congress or the British Parliament, but was, and is, constituted upon the old German model; and it is commonly called in English by the name of "Imperial Diet." Below, to illustrate more clearly the progress made during thirty years, a table of the sessions of the Diet is appended. This table gives the dates of the election, of the opening and the closing ceremonies (in the latter case where the session lived out its natural life), and the dates of suspension, reopening, and dissolution (when a session came to an untimely end).

During the first decade, there were fourteen sessions (of which, of course, four were special); five cases each of suspension and dissolution, the latter of which necessitated five special elections; and no House of Representatives was permitted to serve out its full term of four years, except the one which was elected in August, 1898, and which ran over into the next period. During the second decade, there were twelve sessions (two specials), with three suspensions and two dissolutions (causing two special elections); while one House, elected in 1908, served out its full term, which, however, extended over into the next decade. During that third decade, there were fourteen sessions (six specials), with only one suspension and two dissolutions (requiring two special elections). The large number of special sessions in that period resulted from the deaths of the Emperor and the

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Empress Dowager, and the ultimatum to Germany, and not from dissolution.

These facts and figures are really eloquent. Indeed, a comparison of the figures for the first twenty sessions of the Diet with the figures for the last twenty sessions illustrates most graphically the progress that has been made by constitutionalism in Japan. It is, of course, acknowledged that there is still great room for improvement; that the oligarchic bureaucracy is difficult of dislodgement; that political parties are yet scarcely more than personal factions, given too much to intrigue, inconsistency, compromise, and "spoils"; that the right of franchise should be widely extended; and that the Cabinet should be made responsible to the Diet.

It should be stated, however, that there has been great growth in the power of public opinion, with a strong trend toward a kind of democracy not inconsistent with imperialism. And progress has been made in the extension of popular rights and privileges by laws which have been enacted from time to time, with reference, for instance, to freedom of the press, free speech, freedom of public assemblage, right of property, copyright, right of correspondence, religious freedom, and, more recently, by a considerable extension of franchise rights.

TABLE OF CABINETS

Premier	Term of Office	Years	Months
Yamagata	Dec., 1889—April, 1891	1	5
Matsukata	May, 1891—July, 1892	1	3
Ito	Aug., 1892—Aug., 1896	4	1
Matsukata	Sept., 1896—Dec., 1897	1	4
Ito	Jan., 1898—June, 1898	0	6
Okuma-Itagaki	June, 1898—Oct., 1898	0	4
Yamagata	Nov., 1898—Sept., 1900	1	11
Ito	Oct., 1900—May, 1901	0	8
Katsura	June, 1901—Jan., 1906	4	7
Saionji	Jan., 1906—July, 1908	2	6
Katsura	July, 1908—Aug., 1911	3	2
Saionji	Sept., 1911—Dec., 1912	1	4
Katsura	Dec., 1912—Feb., 1913	0	2
Yamamoto	Feb., 1913—March, 1914	1	1
Okuma	April, 1914—Oct., 1916	2	6
Terauchi	Oct., 1916—Sept., 1918	2	0
Hara	Sept., 1918		

TABLE OF SESSIONS OF THE DIET

Election	Session	Opened	Suspended	Reopened	Dissolved	Closed
July 4, 1890	1	Nov. 29, 1890				March 8, 1891
	2	Nov. 26, 1891			Dec. 25, 1891	
*Feb. 15, 1892	3	May 6, 1892	May 16	May 23		June 15, 1892
	4	Nov. 29, 1892	Jan. 23, 1893	Feb. 7		March 1, 1893
	5	Nov. 28, 1893	Dec. 19	Dec. 29	Dec. 30, 1893	
*March 1, 1894	6	May 15, 1894			June 2, 1894	
*Sept. 1, 1894	7	Oct. 18, 1894				Oct. 22, 1894
	8	Dec. 24, 1894				March 27, 1895
	9	Dec. 28, 1895	Feb. 15, 1896	Feb. 25		March 29, 1896
	10	Dec. 25, 1896				March 25, 1897
	11	Dec. 24, 1897			Dec. 25, 1897	
*March 15, 1898	12	May 19, 1898	June 7	June 10	June 10, 1898	
*Aug. 10, 1898	13	Dec. 3, 1898				March 10, 1899
	14	Nov. 22, 1899				Feb. 24, 1900
	15	Dec. 25, 1900	Feb. 27, 1901	March 10		March 25, 1901
	16	Dec. 10, 1901				March 10, 1902
*Aug. 10, 1902	17	Dec. 9, 1902	Dec. 16	Dec. 28	Dec. 28, 1902	
*March 1, 1903	18	May 12, 1903	May 21	May 23		June 5, 1903
	19	Dec. 10, 1903			Dec. 11, 1903	
March 1, 1904	20	Nov. 30, 1904				March 30, 1904
	21	March 20, 1904				Feb. 28, 1905
	22	Dec. 28, 1905				March 28, 1906
	23	Dec. 28, 1906				March 28, 1907
	24	Dec. 28, 1907				March 28, 1908
May 15, 1908	25	Dec. 25, 1908				March 25, 1909
	26	Dec. 24, 1909				March 24, 1910
	27	Dec. 23, 1910				March 23, 1911
	28	Dec. 27, 1911				March 26, 1912
May 15, 1912	29	Aug. 23, 1912				Aug. 26, 1912
	30	Dec. 27, 1912	Jan. 21, 1913	Feb. 4		March 27, 1913
	31	Dec. 26, 1913				March 26, 1914
	32	May 5, 1914				May 8, 1914
	33	June 22, 1914				June 29, 1914
	34	Sept. 4, 1914				Sept. 10, 1914
	35	Dec. 7, 1914			Dec. 25, 1914	
*March 25, 1915	36	May 20, 1915				June 10, 1915
	37	Dec. 1, 1915				March 1, 1916
	38	Dec. 27, 1916			Jan. 25, 1917	
*April 20, 1917	39	June 23, 1917				July 15, 1917
	40	Dec. 27, 1917				March 28, 1918
	41	Dec. 27, 1918				

*Special elections.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Peace Treaty in the Liberal Press

IT is now possible to print selections from the comments on the Peace Treaty of some of the important liberal and Socialist newspapers of Europe. Brief extracts from three English editorials appeared in the *Nation* of May 24.

The *Manchester Guardian* has continued its careful discussion of the terms in all the issues which have so far reached the United States. On May 8 it began by rejoicing over the reparation of wrongs in Poland, Schleswig, Alsace, and even Silesia, but continued:

Something we fear there is to be set on the wrong side of the account. The complicated arrangement by which France acquires the Saar mines in absolute possession, is thoroughly unsatisfactory and disturbing, and can only tend to keep open a sore. So again the Danzig arrangement. A wedge is driven clean through German territory and a source of deep and permanent unrest created in the heart of Europe. It is in the highest degree undesirable to embody in the treaty what are virtually war conditions, extending over a long period of time. Germany is not in a position to resist any terms we may choose to impose, but a wise policy will no longer treat her as an enemy to be feared and destroyed.

On May 10 the *Guardian* referred to the protests of Chancellor Ebert.

Nothing is easier than for the victor to overreach himself. Does our true interest lie in a Germany so crushed that she will despair of herself and fall a victim first to anarchy and then to reaction? We must not seek even wholly to destroy her sense of national pride and self-respect. Who does not remember the declarations that to a democratic Germany much might be conceded which to a Germany still autocratic could not be allowed? So Germany parted with her militarism to discover that she was still regarded in the same light as before. Who shall say that similar developments may not take place in Russia, and that out of the civil broils we are industriously engaged in there fomenting, reaction may not shortly raise its head and a Kolchak come forward as the destined saviour of society? It all comes back to this: Germany will have to be rebuilt with the rest and we shall have to help her.

The *Guardian* of May 13 said further:

The process of extracting a huge indemnity from a ruined country appears to be not very much different from drawing blood from a stove. On the question of an indemnity and the prolonged military occupation there has been no sign of moderation or even of good sense. In fact, no doubt, it will be found impracticable to enforce them, but that only makes it more foolish to risk the real fruits of peace for a mere vision of financial vengeance.

The *Westminster Gazette* of May 12, in an editorial approving the disposition of Alsace-Lorraine and Poland, disarmament, and the reparation of all damages to civilians, adds:

We see no reason why the German population of the Saar should be alienated from its own Government, and if its destiny is to be determined by a plébiscite fifteen years hence, we hope guarantees will be given against its disturbance in the meantime. Otherwise this district will become a new running sore in the heart of Europe and a lost province for a future Germany to recover. The German people should not be left with an indefinite amount hanging over their heads, or any claim be kept alive which there is no prospect of recovering within a short term of years. The method now proposed both diminishes the chance of recovery by the Allies and destroys the one incentive which Germany might have to pay off their debt. No arrangement is likely to last which artificially cuts Prussia in half. The boundaries should be drawn with strict regard to the definition of the Fourteen Points which speaks of territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations. Boundaries which by including Russian and German populations give Russia and Germany a common incentive to attack the new state would be a misfortune most of all to the Poles.

On the following day the *Gazette* made further comment on the indemnity.

By straining to get a little more than was in their bond, the Allies risk their own peace and give pretext to the enemies to evade their responsibilities. To maintain an impossible claim is bad finance and bad politics. The present reparation clause is an indeterminate sentence which must indefinitely postpone the settling down that is the first need of Europe, and if the politicians pride themselves that they have fulfilled their pledge of great indemnities, they will probably next have to admit that it is at the cost of breaking their promise of no conscription. The two things will not go together, and the reparation clauses must be revised.

In the *Daily News* of May 10, the editor, Alfred G. Gardiner, wrote:

When I find it so wildly agreed that the terms are less harsh than those which Germany would have imposed on us had she won the war, I wonder how they could have been strengthened. It seems to me that the Treaty leaves Germany a mere skeleton. But what Germany would have done is not the criterion of what we should do. Her object was to enslave the world; our object was to set it free. We claimed that our object was not to destroy a nation, but a system of government. Our treaty is the doctrine of *vae victis* without disguise. If the peace terms are the last word we have to say to Germany let us make up our minds for the inevitable consequences. Let us decently bury the covenant and prepare for the next war in whatever quarter it may break.

J. L. Garvin, in a much-quoted leader in the Sunday *Observer*, wrote on May 11:

The vendetta of a thousand years between Gaul and Teuton is not closed but inflamed. Another hopeless vendetta is opened between the Germans and the Poles. Every one of the new states has a new feud with two or three or more of its neighbors. Insistence upon the Treaty of London plus Fiume would mean, as between Italy and Jugoslavia, another irreconcilable vendetta. Except when Poland was vivisected or when Napoleon slashed and trampled Prussia after Jena, no modern nation has ever been so extremely and pitilessly dealt with as the German race is treated today.

These are vistas of inflammable matter and mountains of combustible stuff. This Treaty tends to Balkanize three-fourths of Europe; we repeat our conviction that under the democratic conditions of the twentieth century the thing will not stand and that it will not even last five years. Preserving the peace will not mean the maintenance of this Treaty as it is drawn, but the discarding of a large part of it, the reversal of some of it, and the decisive modification of the whole. The best amongst us did not fight and work only to end by the adoption of German principles now repudiated by millions of the Germans themselves. We fought and worked not only for the mere domination of the victors, not for the selfish security of the few, but for the redemption even of the enemy and for the reconciliation of mankind.

The Dublin *Freeman's Journal* of May 8 considers the economics of the treaty absolutely impossible, and adds:

Obviously the impossible indemnity is meant to be an excuse for annexation that would have done credit to Louis XI or Napoleon. The German bugbear has evidently succeeded the German menace. It will be used to maintain conscription in France, and the pledge to France will be exploited in America

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and England by the militarists and armament profiteers. For the rest, only a mocker would now suggest that Europe has seen the last of its wars. France is sending the dream of *la revanche* across the Rhine.

Common Sense, F. W. Hirst's liberal weekly, made the following comment:

After six months, during which the peoples of Germany, Austria, Poland, Bohemia, and Rumania have been dying of starvation, President Wilson, Mr. Lloyd George, and Mr. Clemenceau have at last agreed upon what is called a Peace Treaty. It is not in any sense of the word a peace of reconciliation. It offends in many respects against the principles on which the German Government agreed to the armistice. The financial clauses of the treaty are such that the people of Germany, helpless, hopeless, workless, and starving will see no prospects whatever of anything approaching prosperity during the lifetime of their youngest citizens. Even if the German delegates sign the peace treaty, we shall have more wars and more troubles on hand than at any period from 1816 to 1913.

To the London *Nation* of May 10, the peace is a "peace without security."

The territorial terms which illustrate most forcibly the violence and dishonesty of the peace relate to the Saar Valley and the Polish acquisitions. The seizure of the wholly German Dantzig is the most perfect security for a future war that the insane diplomacy of France could have devised. The issue is whether the terms imposed by irresistible force upon a resistless enemy may not poison the future with abiding passions of resentment and revenge. These enforced demands for pecuniary compensation are in the first place excessive in amount and secondly intolerable in the method of computation and enforcement. So long as these terms stand, universal militarism is still enthroned as world arbitrator and all the League provisions for justice and conciliation are sounding brass.

The *New Statesman* on May 10 gave its guarded approval to the terms. On May 17 it said:

Second thoughts on the draft treaty are very disquieting. The treaty as a whole is not defensible. As one re-reads it, the hope of founding a real League of Nations on the basis of such a peace fades into a very far-off future—and with it goes the saving grace of the treaty. How many Englishmen are there who feel that it is the peace for which we fought, or could sign it without shame? Germany is left no loophole for escape, no visible hope of economic salvation for decades. But such conditions cumulatively amount to economic slavery. There is no precedent for them even in Prussian documents. Not even the speeches of Herr Scheidemann can justify this peace to the conscience of Europe. All through the Treaty the influence of the twin passions of fear and revenge is discernible—qualified here and there by greed. There is no honor even for the victors in signing such a peace.

To these opinions may be added the conservative comment of Dr. E. J. Dillon in the *Daily Telegraph*.

The peace is being made not, as originally projected, on the basis of the Fourteen Points, nor as predicated by Mr. Wilson, on the lines of territorial equilibrium, but by a compromise which misses the advantage of either, and combines certain evils of both. The treaty has failed to lay the axe to the roots of war, has perhaps increased their number while purporting to destroy them. The germs of future conflicts, not only between the recent belligerents, but also between other groups of states are numerous, and if present symptoms may be trusted will sprout up in the fullness of time.

The French Socialist journals relegate the Treaty to a subordinate position in their pages, giving most of their space to the funeral of a victim of the May-Day demonstration. *L'Humanité* said on May 9:

Instead of being a peace of justice, the most blind and trustful know today that it is, in reality, only a peace of violence, greedy imperialism, and evil. The French proletariat refuses to sign it. In a few days it will protest through its authorized organs against this Bismarckian treaty which is an outrage against the laws of nations as well as against the most elementary morality.

The *Populaire* (May 9) is not surprised at the terms.

We are not in a new age. The age of iron still continues. Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest have been expressly abrogated, but we remain in the tradition of Brest-Litovsk and of Bucharest. The rape of the German colonies is a serious mistake; if the liberty and safety of the Negroes of Africa and Oceanica were being considered, a general solution was necessary, not a hypocritical arrangement which amounts to nothing but a pure and simple change of masters. Let Wilson compare yesterday's text and the doctrines which he has supported! No, it is not the class ruling at London, Paris, Rome, and Washington that will give a durable peace to the world. The treaty will not restore justice, it will not create peace; only evil, disorder, oppression, social war will be continued among the nations.

The *France Libre*, a Socialist organ which has strongly supported the Government, stated in its issue of May 13th, over the signature of Compère-Morel:

The fundamental serious objections which we have a right to make—which we have the imperative duty to make—are those dealing with the Society of Nations and with disarmament. In not bringing about disarmament, the Entente statesmen are really committing treason against humanity. The twenty million human beings who have been crippled and killed certainly believed that they were ending international massacre and that their children would not know those bloody horrors. It is certain that a just, human, and lasting peace will have another air, will give us other guarantees, and have other qualities than the peace laboriously set on foot by the four Allies.

The *Berner Tagwacht* of May 9 declared:

Those naïve persons who still believed until yesterday in a Peace of Right and in a reconciliation of the nations will be terribly disillusioned. The victors demand indemnities and annexations. Alsace-Lorraine is simply annexed. There is no mention of the beautiful phrase "self-determination of peoples." The Saar Valley has the same fate. For good measure, Great Britain, America, and France join in a military alliance against a "German attack"; an alliance that may well be directed against other states also.

The treaty of Brest-Litovsk is today null and void. A scrap of paper, nothing more. And perhaps the time will come sooner than one suspects, when the clever work of Messrs. Wilson, Lloyd George, and Clemenceau will crash upon itself. The consequence will be a new radicalism, the revolution will find new support, and it is easy to see that the Entente will reap entirely different fruit than it hopes for.

The Amsterdam *Handelsblad* (May 8) regards the Treaty with unqualified disapproval.

The question is merely whether it is in the interest of humanity to punish any nation as terribly as the Allies intend to punish the Germans. The Entente seems to desire the complete destruction of Germany. Germany loses her commercial navy, and her shipyards must work for the foreigner. Whole slices of German territory are to be deprived of their liberty. Their people are to be without parliamentary representation. The financial burdens forced upon the country are so terrible that the German people are driven into economic slavery. . . . It is a mockery of Wilson's high-sounding plans. Germany accepted the armistice trusting in the good faith of Wilson's Fourteen Points. That confidence has been so fully broken that we regard the acts of the Versailles Conference not merely as a humiliation for the German people but as a dishonor to all humanity.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Documents

General Smuts and Béla Kun

THE following proposals addressed to the Hungarian Soviet Government by General Smuts on April 4, were published in the *Pester Lloyd* of April 6.

The Hungarian Government is ready to withdraw all the Hungarian troops and armed forces to the west of the following line:

1. The line leaves the River Maros 3 km. east of Makó and passes 3 km. east of Tótkomlós, Békéscsaba, and Békés, from the crossroads of Berettyószentmárton, then 15 km. east of Debrecen, turns northeast of Debrecen, passes a point 5 km. west of Nagyecsed, and reaches the River Szamos north of Nagyecsed.

2. All Rumanian troops receive orders not to advance beyond their present positions.

3. The territory between the line mentioned in Section 1 and the present front of the Rumanian army is to be regarded as a neutral zone, and is to be occupied by Allied troops—British, French, Italian, and, if practicable, American.

4. The Hungarian Government accepts the conditions of the Military Convention which the former Hungarian Government concluded with the Entente and with the Powers allied with it on November 13, 1918, and adheres to them, as also to the conditions of the armistice concluded on November 3, 1918.

5. It is clearly declared that the line of demarcation described above does not affect the territorial regulation which may eventually be determined in the peace conditions.

6. General Smuts will also propose to the Great Powers assembled in Paris to invite the plenipotentiary representatives of the Hungarian Government, before the definite determination of the political frontiers of Hungary in the treaty of peace, to present their standpoint on the question of the frontiers and on all the economic questions arising therefrom in a conference which would be held under the presidency of a representative of the Great Powers with the representatives of the Czecho-Slovak state, Rumania, Jugoslavia, and German-Austria.

The reply of the Hungarian Government to General Smuts, as summarized in the *Enemy Press Supplement* to the *Review of the Foreign Press* (British War Office), follows:

While thanking you in the name of the Government for your benevolent attitude, we are bound to declare that these conditions are of such a kind that they can only be regarded as orders. We ask you, however, to transmit the following proposals to the Entente Governments:

1. The Hungarian Government is ready to form a neutral zone, but only if its boundaries are fixed not only west of the present line of occupation at the line proposed by the General, but also east at the Maros line, which the Military Convention of November, 1918, determined, and which was arbitrarily changed by Order No. 938 of General Besan, to the irreparable loss of our economic life. (Vix's Note, No. 384, December 16, 1918).

(a) In that part of the neutral zone to be evacuated and occupied by Allied troops, the Constitution of the Soviet Republic shall be upheld without any intervention in economic or social conditions. That Constitution shall be restored at Szeged and Arad.

(b) Complete, unrestricted intercourse between the neutral zone and the territory of the Soviet Repubic as well as Rumania.

(c) Free transit [for] traffic in the Transylvanian districts occupied by Rumania.

2. We also demand the complete raising of the blockade, and the supply of coal and fat.

3. We demand the calling of the conference, as suggested by us and accepted by General Smuts. It should sit in Prague or Vienna, concurrently with the Paris Conference. The Government, which does not take its stand on the principle of territorial integrity, opposes the regulation of territorial questions on the basis of imperialistic conquest.

4. We ask to be enabled to send economic representatives, and that the other states should do the same.

5. We request that the Entente Powers shall immediately stop the barbarous persecution of the labor movement in the occupied districts.

We remind the General that our Government has placed foreign subjects and their property under its special protection.

GARBAI, President.
KUN, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs.

The following statement by Béla Kun to the press was made public on April 6.

Since the armistice in November the Entente has carried on no diplomatic relations with us, but only military negotiations. General Smuts, who is staying at present in Budapest, is negotiating with us not as a soldier, but in his diplomatic capacity. This indicates that since the collapse of the imperialist army the dictatorship of the proletariat is the first firmly established power in Hungary, and is recognized by the Entente as such.

The negotiations were of the most cordial character, and there is every reason to hope that the Hungarian Soviet Republic has no hostile attack to expect on the part of the Entente. The General accepted in a friendly spirit our proposal that the representatives of the Governments of the states which have arisen on the territory of the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy should confer, if possible, at Prague or Vienna, concurrently with the Paris Conference. According, therefore, to my proposal, the representatives of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, of the German-Austrian Republic, of the Jugoslav and Rumanian Kingdoms, and of the Czecho-Slovak Republic should meet as soon as possible for a conference at Prague or Vienna. The object of this conference would be to clear up the questions of the political frontiers, a matter which indeed has no special importance for us. It would, however, also have to clear up all those problems which have arisen in relation to economic relations and intercourse between the states interested.

We cherish the hope that this conference will offer a possibility that the right to a more human existence will be guaranteed to the workers in the states which have been formed in the territories of the former Monarchy. The Hungarian Soviet Government is of the opinion that by means of this conference every kind of nationalist and chauvinist movement will be as thoroughly disarmed as all imperialist tendencies.

The revolutionary Soviet Government of the Hungarian Soviet Republic does not take its stand on the basis of territorial integrity, and only insists that no problem shall be solved in accordance with an imperialist policy of conquest.

The negotiations with General Smuts are not yet closed, as there are still questions which have not yet found any solution, including the question of the formation of the neutral zone. In view of the fact that the Government of the Hungarian Soviet Republic has behaved in the most conciliatory way towards foreigners with regard to the security of life and property, and in the amplest manner has guaranteed both their personal inviolability and also the recognition of their property rights, we believe that the General will take all steps to solve these questions in such a manner that the conditions vital to the Hungarian proletariat will be secured. We, on our part, have eliminated all national questions, or those of a similar character, from the negotiations regarding matters of principle.

We take our stand upon our socialist point of view, which means that we are affected only by the social interests of the workers in the occupied districts; and in regard to these we express the hope that the barbarous procedure against the workers' movements in the occupied districts will cease.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Memorial on German Missions

AN important memorial, sent to the Peace Conference by the Society of Friends in London, calls attention to the "grave injury" which will result to the welfare of millions of natives in different parts of the world if provision is not made for continuing the missionary work carried on before the war by German missionary societies. The memorial continues:

It is understood that it has been proposed to exclude, at any rate temporarily, all German missionaries and missionary societies from British possessions, that China is being urged to take a similar course, and that it is likely that German colonies handed over to mandatory Powers will be in the same position. If this were carried out, it is not impossible that some five-sixths of this splendid work would be terminated. We desire to point out: (1) That any such policy of exclusion means that Christian enterprise becomes a matter for exclusive national treatment. This work should be essentially both international and supra-national, and to legislate for it on a merely national basis would be to mistake its contribution to the world order. (2) That the churches of Germany will have scarcely any opportunity for outward expression. This will surely lead to disastrous results for Germany and the world. (3) That temporary exclusion for more than a very short time (say, twelve months) would be tantamount to permanent exclusion. There has already been a long interruption, and it will be difficult enough to resume the work in any case. (4) That, on the other hand, a different policy would do a great deal to help in the strengthening of the best elements in German national life, and in enabling her to take a right and helpful place in the society of nations.

In view of these and other weighty considerations, we . . . urge that all these matters be not hastily decided, but rather be referred to a special commission, which, besides Government officials, should include representative missionary leaders from the different countries, whose duty it shall be to discover means by which this valuable work may be continued, by which German missions and missionaries may, under suitable guarantees and safeguards, be readmitted to the territories concerned, and to emphasize the supra-national character of the Christian enterprise. . . .

A Finnish Decoration for the Kaiser

THE following open letter addressed to Mr. Saastamoinen, representative in the United States of the Mannerheim Government in Finland, was published in *Työmies,* (May 23), a Finnish paper of Superior, Wisconsin.

We have read your statement in the American newspapers with reference to the Government which you represent and its endeavors. . . . We urge you to explain in the generous and conversant manner you have already shown, the details of a matter which became public here just recently.

The matter is the following: The *Helsingin Sanomat,* a newspaper closely in touch with the Finnish bourgeois Government, in an issue (the April number) recently received in this country, states that the Government represented by you has presented a brilliant decoration to a certain gentleman of the trade of executioners who has attained international fame—the former German Kaiser—"which that exalted *Herr* very compassionately promised to carry as a talisman."

Whereas you, Herr Saastamoinen, now announce that you are the representative of that Government here in the United States, we urge you to explain good-naturedly the details of this historic occurrence, for, we take it for granted, it will pay you for the trouble. . . .

Foreign Press

The British Coal Commission Hearings

THE recent hearings on the nationalization of mines, held by the British Coal Commission in the King's Robing Room of the House of Lords, developed an interesting controversy between the representatives of the miners on the Commission and several of the largest titled owners of coal-producing land in Great Britain, subpœnaed by the Commission to give evidence chiefly as to the validity of their titles. The following extracts from the testimony, as reported in the London *Times* of May 8, 9, and 10, indicate the scope and the intent of the inquiry.

Lord Durham, the first witness, is the owner of 12,411 acres of coal land in the Country of Durham, of which, he stated, approximately 6,000 acres were purchased within the last 100 years, 4,000 acres between 1720 and 1820, while the remainder was "ancient land owned by the Lambton family."

Mr. Smillie. I suppose it may be taken that the land, which includes the minerals and metals, is essential to the life of the people? Do you agree?—Lord Durham. If you like, I accept that. They cannot live in the air.

Q. Provided a limited number of people hold the whole of the land, they practically hold the lives of the people in the land at their disposal?—A. I do not accept that.

Q. You do agree that land is essential to the life of the people, but you will not accept the proposal that if the land is in the hands of a limited number of people, practically they hold the lives of the people at their disposal?—A. The lives of the people who live on my land are as happy as those on any other land, and it makes no difference whether I own it or not.

Q. Land is quite as necessary to life as fresh water or air or sunshine?—A. Or bread.

Q. We cannot get bread without land. It is one of its purposes to produce bread. You say you own the coal under 12,411 acres of land in the County of Durham?—A. Yes.

Q. I suppose you claim the ownership of the surface of the land with the minerals under it?—A. Certainly, in nearly every case.

Q. Do you know whether the law of England allows any person to own land in the full sense?—A. I am not a constitutional lawyer, but I consider that my title to my land is established by the laws of this country.

Mr. Smillie then quoted Williams on "Real Property," in which it was said: "The first thing the student has to do is to get rid of the idea of absolute ownership. Such an idea is quite unknown in English law. No man in law is absolute owner of his lands, but only holds estate in them." "Do you agree with Williams?" asked Mr. Smillie.

Lord Durham. I have not read him, but I know I am only tenant for life of those lands.

Q. But you say you own it?—A. For my life. . . .

Mr. Smillie next quoted Coke, who said that all lands were tenements under the law of England and no subject held land except by the King. "Do you agree with Coke?" asked Mr. Smillie.

The witness protested that it was not fair to ask him questions on extracts read without the contexts.

Q. Do you agree with the general proposition that no person can hold land in England under the law, but may possess it for the time being?—A. I do not give an opinion one way or the other. I am not a constitutional lawyer.

Q. I will quote a constitutional lawyer, Blackstone, who says: "It is a received and undeniable principle of law that all lands in England are held immediately of the King." Do you deny Blackstone's authority? If he is correct you cannot hold the land you claim to own.—A. That is your opinion. My family

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BEREA, OHIO

has owned land for a great many years and no one has disputed it.

"We dispute it now," interjected Mr. Smillie amid laughter. Continuing, Mr. Smillie said: "I will quote another. There is a very old Book which says, 'The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof.' I am not exactly sure of the author, but it appears in the Bible, upon which you have promised to tell the truth and the whole truth this morning. Would you deny that authority?"

Lord Durham. I prefer another authority, which says, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's."

Mr. Smillie. That is exactly what I want to be done at the present time, because if "the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof," it cannot be the property of individuals. (Laughter.)

Lord Durham (to the Chairman). Is this an ecclesiastical examination? (Loud laughter.)

Mr. Smillie. What we are endeavoring to arrive at is whether any person is entitled to or can claim ownership of the minerals. I am wanting to find out, if possible, whether or not any individual, or individuals, are entitled to claim absolute ownership of the coal or other minerals under the surface of the soil?

Lord Durham. I have told you, I do not know.

Q. If you don't know, how comes it that you say in your *précis* that you own the coal?—A. Yes; I have told you before. I and my family own the land and the minerals beneath. . . .

Q. You say you possess the titles to justify your ownership of land and minerals. Only a very small proportion of your owning dates a long way back. A small portion of the land was secured as a grant from the Crown?—A. Certainly not that I know of. . . .

Q. Do you know whether the land that was held prior to that bought between 1720 and 1820 was bought or not by the Lambton family—was it a grant from the crown?—A. I feel sure it was not. I believe my family have been there many hundred years. There is no charter or evidence to prove that we have ever had a grant from the Crown or anybody else. . . .

Q. I have a feeling that you have no title deeds which justify your ownership of land or minerals, and that being the case I would suggest you ought to give it back to the state, who is the proper owner of it, if I am correct. Now you say that neither you nor your father, who succeeded the first Earl of Durham, has ever prevented coal from being worked by refusing to lease. Does not that answer postulate that if you cared to prevent coal from being worked you could have refused to lease?—A. I suppose it could have been done, but I should never dream of refusing to renew a lease.

Q. That is not the point; you may be a generous landlord.—A. That is very kind of you.

Q. I say you may be, but as a matter of fact that postulates your right to refuse to lease the coal which you hold. Do you agree?—A. I have no doubt.

Q. If you own the coal, and have the right to refuse to lease it, other landowners in your position may do the same?—A. I suppose so.

Q. That would mean that a comparatively small number of people, in refusing to lease the coal of this country, would consequently hold the country in their hands to that extent?—A. You mean, they are blackmailers?

Q. No; I do not mean they are blackmailers. I mean they have the power to do this?—A. I think the state would intervene, just as it would if there were a miners' strike or a railway strike and the population were suffering thereby.

Q. Do you think the state has the same right over landholders refusing to exercise the powers they hold?—A. Yes.

Q. You and fellow landholders in the country hold perhaps a more important right than that—you could refuse to let the surface of your land for cultivation, could you not?—A. Yes; I have the perfect right to cultivate my own land. . . .

Q. I think you have not very much faith in the Government taking over the working of the mines successfully?—A. No; I don't think it would be either economical or successful. . . .

Q. It is the proposal of those who favor nationalization that the industry should be worked as a whole. You are aware that that is not the case at the present time?—A. Of course I am aware of that.

Q. You are aware that there are many collieries today which are called poor collieries. That is not because of bad management, but because of their situation and the nature of the seam?—A. Yes.

Q. Would there be any harm in working the mines of the nation as a whole under the Government?—A. I am not at all sure that the Government would be the proper authority to carry it out successfully.

Q. You would not object to the principle of all mineowners pooling their funds and running the industry as one national concern?—A. I don't know about any other districts but my own, and I don't know very much about that; but the coalowners in the County of Durham are very sensible people and work together as much as possible.

Q. Not on the lines of helping the poorer collieries through?—A. I have not come here to advertise myself, but I have myself lent money to collieries to tide over bad times.

Q. You would be very hopeful that they would get over those bad times?—A. I would be very hopeful of getting my money back. (Laughter.) . . .

Further questioned by Mr. Hodges as to whether it was a profitable position to go on working mines the witness replied that they varied very much. His principal reason for leasing them was that he hadn't got sufficient money to spend on them. Several hundred thousand pounds was required as capital.

"You seem to think," added the witness, "that I have no pride or interest in the people who live on my property. Mr. Smillie tried to make out that I have no interest in them. But I was anxious that all these people should live well, and when I found a very rich gentleman who was eminently an authority on coal mines willing to lease these collieries, it was good for my people and for myself."

Q. Then it was other people's capital applied to your property which gave you an income? Without capital applied you could not draw royalty?—A. No one can get royalties unless the coal is worked.

Q. The capitalist cannot get profit unless he engages labor?—A. No.

Q. So that labor applied gives the capitalist an income, and you an income?—A. It gives me a return on the money which has been spent on starting the collieries. I have no doubt my forefathers spent large sums in developing them, and it is very reasonable that I should get some return. The bigger the return the more I shall be pleased, if it does not hurt anybody else.

Q. If there were no workmen who could be applied to the exploitation of your mineral property, it would be economically valueless?—A. I agree, and if there were no people living in England it would be a desert island. (Laughter.)

Q. Who do you think has a prior right to any property, the man who makes it economically valuable or those who live upon its being economically valuable?—A. I do not think that there is any prior right. There is only one person who has a right to his property, and that is the man who owns it. . . .

After luncheon Mr. Herbert Smith asked Lord Durham: "Don't you think the law is entirely wrong that you should have this monopoly and get five and one-half pence on every ton of coal produced?"—A. No; I do not think so.

Q. Don't you think it would be better to give it to the men who suffer injury and accident instead of to you, and let you do some useful work?—A. The men get compensation.

Q. You get £35,000 a year for doing nothing?—A. Thank you. I am not aware that I do nothing.

In reply to Mr. Cooper, Lord Durham said he was Lord Lieutenant of the County of Durham, and during the war he had done a great deal to foster recruiting. "I think," said the wit-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness, "that the miners volunteered for the war admirably." . . .

Mr. Balfour. I think you agree that the state, when they take over your royalties or any property of mine, should pay compensation?—A. Certainly.

Q. In other words, if the rights of property are not respected in this country, the whole credit of the country would be wrong?—A. There would be a state of chaos.

Q. People would not trade with this country?—A. No.

Q. We have a fair example of the disregard of rights of property in Russia, which has made nobody happy and everybody miserable?—A. Yes.

The next witness, Lord Dynevor, owns 9,300 acres of land in Carmarthenshire and Glamorganshire, of which about 8,270 acres produce coal.

Lord Dynevor. . . . From 1541 to 1793 my predecessors worked the minerals and developed the industry, and must have spent considerable sums of money in doing so. I succeeded my late father in 1911.

Replying to Mr. Hodges, the witness said he was not aware that many small collieries in South Wales had gone to the wall. All the collieries in his district were working.

Q. You relieved the burden in that case a little bit?—A. I think rather considerably.

Q. Do you think it right they should have to pay you 5d. or 4½d. a ton when they are struggling against natural difficulties in that colliery?

The witness said he thought the colliery was in a much better condition today.

Mr. Hodges put it that that was owing to the fact that there was a great demand for coal of any sort?—A. Probably so.

Q. Would you have any objection to the state taking over the control?—A. That is a general question. I should like to see the Bill before I pledged myself to that.

Q. Do you think the state is competent to get the minerals worked efficiently?—A. At the present moment I understand the state does not like working its own collieries.

The witness instanced the case of the Forest of Dean, which was let to private workers. Mr. Hodges said the Forest of Dean collieries were not regarded as a very good commercial proposition.

In answer to Mr. Evan Williams, the witness repeated that his family lost the whole of their estates when Henry VIII cut his ancestor's head off.

Mr. Evan Williams. Your estates, then, were in a sense nationalized. (Laughter.)

The witness said that before the beheading took place his ancestor owned, among other things, the whole of Carnarvonshire and Pembrokeshire. . . .

The Duke of Northumberland, owner of 169,000 acres of surface land and 244,500 acres of proved mineral rights, much of it dating back to early royal grants, testified that part of the property had been worked "more or less continuously" since the thirteenth century.

Mr. Smillie. I think that this Commission is primarily concerned about whether or not it is possible for any individual to own land under the law of this country. Several authorities have been quoted who state that private ownership in land is against the principle of the law of England. Do you know whether this is so?—The Duke. I do not know. That is a question which only an expert property lawyer can possibly answer, and I suggest that if you want to get at the law you should call an expert lawyer. . . .

Q. It has been laid down by experts that private ownership of land is impossible and against the law?—A. I am afraid I know as little about law as you do. (Laughter.)

Mr. Smillie. If it is true that you know as little as I do, you are amazingly ignorant of the law, for I know nothing about it. (Renewed laughter.) Do you know whether the Crown, from which you received grants, held the land of England on behalf of the nation or under a personal right?—A. I am only giving you an opinion—it is not worth much, it may be worth nothing—that the Crown held it under their own personal right.

Q. You believe that the land of England belonged to the ruling King for the time being?—A. I think so.

Q. And that he had the right to grant any land to any individual?—A. I believe so. . . .

Q. Would it be possible for you to put in for examination the charters or titles under which you were granted the land?—A. I think it would; certainly.

Q. Are the lands granted by the Crown extensive as compared with the 244,000 acres you own?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you give us the proportion?—A. I cannot say the proportion, but they are extensive. In a great many cases the lands which had been originally granted by the Crown were forfeited by Acts of Attainder and regranted, and in some cases purchased, so that in many cases, where the land was originally granted and retaken, it was subsequently purchased back.

Q. In the case of repurchase I suppose the persons who sold them will be able to show the title that they were entitled to sell?—A. I think so. . . .

The Duke. I should do my utmost in the House of Lords and in trying to organize opposition in the country to any scheme of nationalization.

Q. Would you do more than an ordinary enfranchised citizen? Would you do more than cast your vote?—A. Certainly. I should do my utmost. I should do much more than cast my vote. I should spare no effort in speaking and in organization that I could possibly make in order to prevent it. . . . The Miners' Federation do not want it. They are only in for this scheme as a step to something far worse, something far more revolutionary.

Q. What is that?—A. The confiscation of all land. It is only an expression of opinion, but I think they want to control the sources of production of all industries. I think they want the complete control of the coal industry for themselves.

Q. And therefore it is out of regard to the national interest that you oppose nationalization?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know that the Miners' Federation have their own ideas that property ought to be worked on a more up-to-date plan?—A. I dare say they do.

Q. Would any scheme put forward for that purpose bear any relation to the confiscation of land?—A. They have said that they are out for the confiscation of land.

Q. Who said they were?—A. I saw that Mr. Smillie in an address on May 4 said that he wanted the whole of the land. I think he said in a question to a previous witness that he was out for confiscation—or nationalization, as he put it.

Mr. Smillie. All the minerals of the land.—The Duke. I think you said confiscation of land.

Mr. Smillie. I am out for the taking over of all land.—The Duke. A most interesting admission. . . .

Mr. Herbert Smith. If this Commission recommend nationalization, you would use your influence in the House of Lords to defeat it?—A. Certainly. What has this Commission got to do with me? . . .

Q. Why do you oppose nationalization?—A. Because it is only a blind—perhaps it is more correct to say a stage to something more revolutionary. . . .

Q. Can you quote an instance where the miners have said that they wanted the sole control of trade in their own hands?—A. No, they would not say that. That would be giving the whole show away. (Laughter.) . . .

The witness said that he did not know the facts about the death rate of Durham or Northumberland.

Mr. Smith. Is it not worth your time to make inquiries about it?—A. You seem to think a landowner should do nothing but read statistics. I am a very hard-worked man. I am not a privileged person like you. I cannot afford to waste time sitting on a Commission. . . .

Q. Have you built any houses?—A. Since I only succeeded a year ago, and as you know that during that time no houses have been built, I do not see how I could do so. . . . The miners

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are not the only people in the world. I have other people to look after as well as miners. . . .

Sir Leo Money. You came here to defend your own interests?—A. Certainly.

Q. What particular service do you perform for the community as a coalowner?—A. As an owner of coal I do not perform any service for the community. I look after my property to my best advantage. I do not know whether you call that service.

Q. The personal service you perform is very slight?—A. The service which a landowner performs on a large estate is in generally managing it.

Sir Leo Money asked the witness whether he considered it a bad thing that miners and their families, who represented about one-tenth of the population, should have a monopoly of the coal trade.—A. Yes.

Q. Don't you think it is a bad thing for one man to own as much as you do?—A. No, I think it is an excellent thing. . . .

Lord Londonderry, the next witness, is the owner of several collieries in the County of Durham in addition to 5,808 acres of coal-producing land in the same county. The *précis* of his evidence, as read before the Commission, concluded:

I am opposed to the nationalization of coalmines. I do not believe that my collieries will be carried on more efficiently, or that the conditions of the workmen will be better, under state ownership than they have been whilst the collieries have been worked by myself and my ancestors. I am the chairman of the Londonderry Collieries (Limited), and I have no desire to sever my association with my colliery property, in which I wish to take a personal interest. My father died in February, 1915, and owing to the war and to my military service in France, I have not been able to take the close interest in my business which I otherwise should have done, but as soon as my duties as a member of the Air Ministry have terminated, it is my intention to devote more of my time to my business and to my interests in the county of Durham, in which my principal English residence of Wynyard is situated.

Mr. Hodges. If this Commission reports in favor of the nationalization of minerals after considering all the facts, will you oppose any legislation to that effect?—A. Yes, I shall certainly oppose legislation for nationalization. I take it that the Report of the Commission is to advise the Government. In my view, my opinion is as good as any individual member of the Commission.

Q. Your opposition is based upon the assumption that you believe in the inalienable right of private property?—A. Yes, I believe in private ownership of property.

Q. You believe more particularly in holding your own private property?—A. I believe in holding my own, like the coat on my back or the coat on yours. . . .

Q. Suppose we could prove to you that the holding of your property was not conducive to the national interest and was a source of national disturbance, would you consider that warranted you in changing your opinion as to the rights of property?—A. If the community became anarchical they would probably take everybody's property. If the community thought it was a good thing they would do it. I do not think it will come.

Q. Supposing we could prove scientifically that by the way the land is held the state is not getting the best out of it?—A. Who is going to prove it?

Q. This Commission may prove it.—A. That does not mean much to me. I have studied this as much as any individual member of this Commission. . . .

Lord Tredegar stated the extent of his properties as follows: 32,000 acres in Monmouthshire, 7,000 acres in Glamorganshire, and 43,000 acres in Breconshire; of which areas approximately 18,800 acres bear coal.

Mr. Hodges. Supposing a man held property to which he could show no title in law, and the nation decides to sequester that property, do you think on principle that he would be entitled to compensation?—Lord Tredegar. If it is not his property by law he is not entitled to compensation. If the law of England allows me to have property I am entitled to compensation.

Q. I have no doubt you would pursue that opinion if such a Bill came before the House of Lords?—A. Yes.

Q. But if a man has no title deeds?—A. Then he has not got the property.

Q. You know that in South Wales there has been a considerable agitation in the past about the land—so much so that there was a Land Commission set up some years ago. That Commission failed to come to any useful conclusion, because it had not authority to compel witnesses to produce titles of their property. Arising out of that, are you aware of a speech made by Mr. Lloyd George on the subject of landlordism in South Wales?—A. I had nothing to do with the property then. I was probably on service then, and did not follow events.

Q. Do you not know from your experience whether the mineral owners in South Wales have got a creditable record in relation to the people?—A. Certainly.

Q. Would you be surprised if, in 1912, Mr. Lloyd George differed very violently from that view?—A. I would not be surprised. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hodges than read the following quotation from a speech delivered by Mr. Lloyd George at Swansea in June, 1912: "It is trust property and we mean to examine the conditions of it. We are seeking but our own. In the South Wales valleys you have got hundreds of thousands a year paid in rent, groundrent, dead rent, wayleaves, royalties, licenses, and fees, all of which I once called and will call again, 'the black retinue of exaction.' Who by, and by what right? Paid by men who risk their lives for it; paid by men who spend their days in dust and darkness to win it. There is not a single day of their lives that they do not give two hours, two hours stolen from the sunlight, two hours of additional jeopardy to life to pay the exactions. They came to seek rest and restoration and they find crowded habitations, houses often unfit for human habitation. Landlordism has ground and pressed them so that when they come up, instead of finding renewed vigor and strength they breed disease and degradation. Men whose wealth they make at the risk of their lives grudge them every inch of sunlight, air space, breathing ground. That is a trust that will be looked into."

Mr. Cooper asked whether the speech was delivered at a political meeting.

Mr. Hodges. I presume it was. (Laughter.)

Mr. Cooper. Mr. Lloyd George was not then in his present responsible position.

Mr. Hodges. He was Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. Hodges asked the witness if the speech was a fair statement of conditions in South Wales.—Lord Tredegar. Certainly not.

Q. If the speech is true, do you think that mineral owners should continue to hold such large tracts of minerals as are held in South Wales?—A. Certainly. . . .

Mr. Balfour inquired whether, if it were decided to confiscate property, it could not equally be decided to confiscate the cottages which miners themselves had erected. Lord Tredegar agreed.

Mr. Balfour suggested that such action would break down the whole title of right to property in the country, and cause confusion and Bolshevism.—Lord Tredegar. Yes. . . .

Referring to Mr. Balfour's question about the right to confiscate the miners' cottages, Mr. Smillie said: "It is possible for human brains and hands to build cottages, but is it possible for you or any other landlord to create an inch of soil?"—A. No, but we can develop it.

Q. Is not there a wonderful difference between confiscating what can be created by human effort and confiscating something which the Creator made for the use of all people, and which no one can reproduce?—A. There is a great difference.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Q. You still think you have as much right to confiscate a miner's life savings—the cottage—as to confiscate the land which neither you nor anyone else has done anything to produce?—A. I have done a great deal in output.

Q. To produce the land?—A. No.

Mr. Smillie. Is it on the same plane to confiscate a cottage built with the life savings of a man and confiscate land no landlord ever did anything to create?—A. I am not aware they have confiscated anything. . . .

Q. Did you admit, in reply to Mr. Balfour, that it would be a handy thing to have your title deeds if you were asking for compensation? I think the state would not be likely to compensate persons who didn't produce title deeds.—A. Very likely not. I should prefer to hang on to my title deeds until they were taken away from me.

Mr. Smillie. I think it would be wise to. (Laughter.)

Further questioned by Mr. Smillie, Lord Tredegar said he had been a naval officer for four and a half years. He was aware that a very large number of miners left the district and joined the army. He did not think military service entitled a man to land when he came back. He was not sure if the sailors and soldiers wanted it.

Mr. Smillie. You don't think that service for the country is a justification for expecting to get land. Would you believe that a large number of the landlords in this country claim that the largest amount of land they possess was given by kings for service rendered in war?—A. In some cases it may have been.

Q. Are you aware that 200,000 acres have been granted by kings to persons for service rendered in war; and, if so, why do you say that common people, colliers, and other workmen have no right to expect such rewards?—A. If land is available, by all means let them have it.

Mr. Smillie. It only becomes available if taken away from you. (Laughter.)

Lord Tredegar. Is it any reason because I served in the war that I should have my land taken from me? I think that for those who served in the war everything that possibly can be done should be done.

Lord Bute was next called, and submitted a *précis* giving his holdings of land as 128,582 acres and his proved mineral rights as 48,878 acres.

Mr. Hodges asked Lord Bute if he had studied the history relating to the property granted in 1547-1550 to Sir William Herbert, his ancestor.—A. No, I have not done so. The only thing I know about it is that one of his services was the raising of an army, but there were other services too.

Q. Are you quite sure of that?—A. So I have been told.

Mr. Hodges then quoted from what he said was a copy of the actual document which granted the property to Sir William Herbert. This document stated that the grant was made "for quelling rebels in the western part of England." "Did you know that before?"—A. I had heard of it.

Q. The theory that he raised an army does not quite square with that?—A. Yes it does. He raised the army to quell rebels. . . .

Q. If that was the service rendered, who was the judge to recognize the value of that service; was it the King?—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. The King signs this document, and he was between ten and fourteen years of age when he signed it. You are aware that Edward VI died when he was fifteen, so that, in effect, a minor in the sense of the law transferred to Sir William Herbert one of the greatest properties that has ever been known to be granted to anyone, except, perhaps, the Duke of Northumberland. Would that be a legal transaction?—A. Yes, I am advised it was.

Q. Even though he was between ten and fourteen years of age, he had the authority to grant that property to your ancestor?—A. Yes.

Q. Your ancestor was one of the executors of the will of King Henry VIII, was he not?—A. I don't know.

Q. Don't you think it should be an elementary duty for anyone in your position to acquaint himself with documents which entitle him to possess that property?—A. I am afraid there are too many documents to go over. I have not time.

Q. I know life is rather a hurry, but fortunately someone found this document, and preserved it. You are aware it was lost for a couple of centuries, are you not?—A. No.

Q. Are you aware that it was discovered in the Records Office by Mr. H. Hobson Matthews, in the employ of the Cardiff Corporation?—A. No.

Q. Are you aware that the Cardiff Corporation still possess this deed?—A. So I believe.

Q. And in effect the conclusion is generally held in South Wales by those best able to judge that the executor of the will of Henry VIII appropriated for himself under the signature of the King, who was then ten years of age, all the lordships of Miskin, Glynrhondda, Llangrisant, and Pentrych and Clun, and about thirty more in Monmouthshire and Breconshire. Are you aware of that?—A. No.

Mr. Hodges quoted from the *South Wales Daily News* of June 1, 1912, which, he said, made this statement in referring to the grant of land to Sir William Herbert: "It will be seen that Sir William Herbert, one of the guardians of the boy King Edward VI, granted to himself enormous areas of land, which at that time, were in the possession of the Crown, using the boy King's name in order to enrich himself." The article also stated: "Literally millions of money had been paid and received as the outcome of this gigantic fraud."

Mr. Hodges. You know the *South Wales Daily News* very well. A very respectable paper, is it not?—A. I would rather not pass an opinion. (Laughter.) . . .

Mr. Hodges also stated that the *South Wales Daily News* produced a map showing exactly the extent of the land which was acquired, the property extending from Chepstow to Swansea. "If that be the case," he said, "and this Commission decided that it was for the benefit of posterity that the minerals in that property, being of great national value, should be acquired back for the nation in the interests of the future, would you suggest that the nation now should compensate you in this generation out of public funds for the retaking of those minerals for national use?—A. Yes, I should. . . .

Q. Even if that compensation were made by the poor taxpayers of this country?—A. I am included among the poor taxpayers.

Q. Do you suggest that, after holding the property for 360 years on the signature of a boy King, ten years old, when the nation wants it back the nation should compensate you and your successors?—A. Yes; the nation recognizes my rights.

Q. Exactly; but should it be continued indefinitely in that way?—A. I think it should.

Q. You think that for all time your heirs and successors should enjoy the property which you and your ancestors have enjoyed for so long?—A. I think the right should be recognized.

Q. Don't you think it might be necessary that you or one of your successors might in turn have to raise another army to quell another lot of rebels?—The witness did not reply.

Mr. Hodges. It was because there was such an indication that this Commission had to begin its sittings.

Contributors to this Issue

J. Ramsay Macdonald, one of the founders of the Independent Labor party of Great Britain, is a member of the executive committee of the Second Internationale.

Ernest Wilson Clement is an American journalist in Tokio who has made a special study of the problem of constitutionalism in Japan.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

A BRITISH "Middle Class Union" was inaugurated on April 5 at a meeting held at London. The presiding officer, Major Pretyman Newman, M.P., explained that the Union was not "middle class" as the term applied to rank, but represented the "middle interest," the people who were between organized capital on the one hand and organized labor on the other. He declared that the Government was deferential to organized labor, and respectful to organized capital, but that the middle classes "could not cross the threshold of Downing Street." W. L. George, commenting on the new Union in the London *Daily Herald* of April 23, expressed a different view of the organization: " . . . When last year the Labor party wisely opened its ranks to all men and women, when a number of doctors, barristers, and artists entered the labor field, capitalism grew nervous. Thus the Middle Class Union, that modern reincarnation of our old enemy, the Property Defense League, came to birth."

THE Federation of Engineering and Shipbuilding Trade Unions of Great Britain has refused to take over the national Shipyards at Chepstow and Beachley, which the Government, after trying for several months to sell to various private firms as well as to the Coöperative Wholesale Society, offered to the Unions. The Admiralty took control of the yards in 1917, nominally with the purpose of expediting shipbuilding, and embarked upon an extravagant plan of expansion. In spite of an enormous outlay, the Government has not succeeded in making the yards pay, partly because the plan of Sir Eric Geddes, to work them with the labor of soldiers and prisoners of war, was defeated by the trade unions on the ground that it might be a menace to other shipbuilding centres. The reason upon which the Federation based its refusal of the Government's offer was that such a venture was contrary to its policy, which favors the development of national resources under Government ownership. The Federation demanded that the yards remain the property of the nation, and be carried on in the national interest.

A CONFERENCE held at Paris by the French Colonial Union and the British Association of West African Merchants has resulted in the formation of a joint Franco-British committee on African affairs. The primary object of the Committee is to secure uniform legislation in France and in Great Britain upon questions affecting the development of colonial territories in Africa. This undertaking is regarded as the first step in an important movement toward Franco-British colonial coöperation.

THE parties of the Left in the Spanish Parliament published on May 19 a resolution in which they bound themselves under oath to consider the Parliament to be elected on June 1 as unlawful, because of the illegal conditions under which it was to be chosen. The resolution declared that owing to the continued suspension of consitutional rights, including the rights of assembly, the coming Parliament would not represent actual public opinion, and must, therefore, be regarded as factional. All proposed laws, including the budget, were to be rejected without discussion.

ACCORDING to a statement made by Dr. Dionisio Castro, head of the department of jurisprudence in the national university of El Salvador, the two issues at stake in the presidential election to be held in Honduras next October are the question of the return of German-owned property, valued at about $70,000,000, to persons from whom it was confiscated by the Government upon the entrance of Honduras into the war, and the question of uniting El Salvador and Honduras to form the Republic of Morozan. The present Government is intensely pro-Ally, and its candidate, Dr. Nazario Soriano, formerly Consul-General of Honduras at New Orleans, supports the Government policies both with regard to alien property and the proposed union with El Salvador. The more important opposition candidate, Dr. Alberto Membrerio, former Honduran Minister to the United States, is in favor of the proposed union, and in the event of his election is expected to push the project. The third candidate, General Gutierrez, is backed by the military party, but has little training in politics and is not expected to figure largely in the elections.

A MEMORANDUM on the claims of Persia has been submitted to the Peace Conference by Mr. Taqizadeh, a Teheran member of the Persian Parliament. The memorandum requests that the Persian delegates be given an opportunity to state their case before the Conference which shall then embody its decision in the matter in a clause inserted in the general international treaty. Persia asks that the occupation of its territory by foreign troops cease and that the evacuation be completed by a fixed date; and that all illegal and reactionary treaties and obligations be cancelled. These include not only extorted privileges and concessions but also such political and economic arrangements as the Anglo-Russian agreements of 1907 and 1916, which are now said to be "in suspense." The memorandum also demands the extension of the authority of the Persian courts over foreigners, and requests outside financial aid, and the admission of Persia to the League of Nations.

AT a mass meeting of American citizens of Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Lettish, and Esthonian descent, held at Carnegie Hall on May 25, resolutions were adopted declaring that the republics of Lithuania, Ukraine, Latavia, and Esthonia had been set up in agreement with the principles proclaimed by President Wilson and the Allies, and calling upon the Allied nations to recognize the independence of those states, and to lend them moral and material assistance. The resolutions condemned the Polish invasion of Lithuania and the Ukraine as a brutal violation of the war aims pronounced by President Wilson and the Allied Governments, and urged that the Allies compel Poland to withdraw its troops from the invaded territories. Anti-Jewish outrages in Lithuania and the Ukraine were deprecated, and the United States was petitioned to take all necessary steps to prevent their continuation or recurrence.

The
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Section

of the *Nation*, containing articles on international questions, English texts of important documents, selected editorials and other matter from the foreign press, and news notes of events throughout the world, is issued fortnightly with the coöperation of the following

Advisory Council

André-Louis Chevrillon, Paris.
Winston Churchill, Windsor, Vermont.
Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.
The Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster, Ottawa, Canada.
John A. Hobson, London.
Henry Goddard Leach, American-Scandinavian Foundation.
John Bassett Moore, Columbia University.
Gilbert Murray, Oxford.
Rómulo S. Naón, Washington.
Joseph Reinach, Paris.
James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.
Jacob H. Schiff, New York.
Oscar S. Straus, New York.
Frank A. Vanderlip, New York.

The International Relations Section is sold only in connection with the *Nation*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ideal for Summer Reading

THE OXFORD BOOKS OF VERSE

To the lover of poetry, no volumes could be more welcome than these choice anthologies. Their very physical appearance conveys a sense of ripeness and ease and grace in the intellectual life and their pages are a source of unending delight.

A New Volume

THE OXFORD BOOK OF AUSTRALASIAN VERSE

Chosen by W. MURDOCK

Net $3.00

A book with the tang of the antipodes: the fresh and rapidly moving picture of new lands and scenes. An interesting selection of some two hundred poems by Australians and New Zealanders, from Wentworth and Adam Lindsay Gordon to the poets of the present day.

Other Volumes in the Series

Each, net $3.00

EDINBURGH BOOK OF SCOTTISH VERSE
1300-1900
Selected and Edited by W. MACNEILE DIXON

OXFORD BOOK OF BALLADS
Chosen and Edited by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH

OXFORD BOOK OF FRENCH VERSE
XIII CENTURY-XIX CENTURY—(*in French*)
Chosen by ST. JOHN LUCAS

OXFORD BOOK OF ITALIAN VERSE
XIII CENTURY-XIX CENTURY—(*in Italian*)
Chosen by ST. JOHN LUCAS

OXFORD BOOK OF ENGLISH VERSE
A. D. 1250-1900
Chosen and Arranged by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH

OXFORD BOOK OF ENGLISH MYSTICAL VERSE
Chosen by D. S. NICHOLSON *and* A. H. LEE

OXFORD BOOK OF SPANISH VERSE
XIII CENTURY-XX CENTURY—(*in Spanish*)
Chosen by JAMES FITZMAURICE-KELLY, F.B.A.

OXFORD BOOK OF GERMAN VERSE
(*In German*)
Chosen and Edited by H. G. FIEDLER

DUBLIN BOOK OF IRISH VERSE
1728-1909
Edited by JOHN COOKE

THE OXFORD BOOK OF VICTORIAN VERSE
Chosen and Edited by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH

OXFORD BOOK OF CANADIAN VERSE
Chosen by WILFRED CAMPBELL

OXFORD BOOK OF LATIN VERSE
(*In Latin*)
Edited by H. W. GARROD

Also on Oxford India Paper

Cloth, Net $3.75 *Persian, Net* $6.00 *Full Morocco, Net* $10.00

Uniform with the Above

A BOOK OF THE SEA

Selected and Edited by LADY SYBIL SCOTT

Net $3.00

India Paper as above

An anthology divided into four parts: Lyrics, Reflections and Pictures, Stories of Beauties and Wonders, and Sailors, Their Deeds and Songs; containing poems, translations and prose pieces.

"Nine out of ten people will recognize immediately the value of this particular work, in which distinctive taste and a good deal of personal courage have united with an almost uncanny knowledge of sea literature from the earliest ages."—*N. Y. Sun.*

OXFORD BOOK OF AMERICAN ESSAYS

Chosen by BRANDER MATTHEWS

Net $1.50

On India Paper, Net $2.75

A notable collection of thirty-two essays wise, witty and serious, representative of the best American work from Franklin and Irving to Crothers and Trent. The graceful introduction is not less attractive.

The Editor's aim has been to show "our significant traits, the diversity and breadth of our interests rather than the presenting of individual performers."

THE BOOK OF SORROW

Chosen and Arranged by A. MACPHAIL

Net $3.00

India Paper as above

"This volume contains much that has been said—in fact almost all that has been well said—upon the theme of sorrow."

Two hundred and seventy authors are represented, including Addison, Bridges, Bronté, Bliss Carman, Austin Dobson, Dante, E. W. Goose, Heine, Herrick, Lowell, Milton, Henry Newholt, Swinburne, Katherine Lyman, Whitman and many others of equal prominence.

Take this ad to your bookseller. Give him your name and we will send you, free of charge, our illustrated magazine, "The Periodical." *If no bookseller is convenient, make request directly to us.*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
American Branch
35 West 32nd Street
New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED